DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 023 HE 011 953

AUTHOR Grites, Thomas J.
TITLE Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Reports, No. 7, 1979.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 74p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admissions Counselors; *Career Planning; College Admission; College Students; Delivery Systems; *Educational Coordination; *Educational Counseling; Educational History; *Faculty Advisors; Higher Education; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Peer Counseling; Personal Growth; State of the Art Reviews; *Student College Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

The historical development of academic advising, the methods employed to provide this service, and the interrelationship of this process with other campus constituencies are examined. Academic advising in American higher education has evolved from a routine, isolated, single-purpose, faculty activity to a comprehensive process of academic, career, and personal development performed by personnel from most elements of the campus community. The most common advising delivery systems include faculty advising, professional staff advisors in advisement centers, and peer or paraprofessional advising programs. The advising and registration functions provide an effective interface for cooperative effort, and another administrative interface is consolidated under the area of student affairs. The most obvious interface in the advising program is with the faculty, primarily through development and implementation of the curriculum. Three primary conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the literature on academic advising: (1) advising cannot be done in isolation; (2) there is no single formula for a successful advising program; and (3) academic advising will play a more prominent role in the future of higher education. A bibliography and eight recommendations that could be used by institutions as they assess their advising program--including implementation of assessment studies and reward systems--are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

7

REPORT

Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties

Thomas J. Grites

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED178023

HE011 953

ERIC/AAHE 1979

4.00

Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties

Thomas J. Grites

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education
Research Report No. 7, 1979

Prepared by the
ERIC® Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20036

Published by
the American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official views or opinions of either the American Association for Higher Education or the National Institute of Education.

Already Published in the 1979 Series

1. Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality — $4.00
   Judith Gappa and Barbara Uehling

2. Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited — $4.00
   Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

3. Budgeting in Higher Education — $4.00
   J. Kent Caruthers and Melvin Orwig

4. The Three "R's" of the Eighties: Reduction, Retrenchment, and Reallocation — $4.00
   Kenneth P. Mortimer and Michael L. Tierney

5. Occupational Programs in Four-Year Colleges: Trends and Issues — $4.00
   Dale F. Campbell and Andrew S. Korim

6. Evaluation and Development of Administrators — $4.00
   Robert C. Nordvall

To subscribe to the Research Report series (10 issues starting from date of subscription), write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. The subscription rate for AAHE members is $25, for nonmembers $35. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

Foreword

The academic quality or reputation of an institution is often measured by its parts: the national ranking of its faculty, the type of facilities, and the basic intelligence of its students. This type of discrete measurement misses one of the most important elements that determines academic quality: academic effectiveness or fit. Academic effectiveness can be defined as the degree to which the academic capabilities and needs of a student are met by the curriculum of the institution.

Concern for academic fit should start when a student applies for admission. The question should be asked, Does the school offer a curriculum that meets this particular student's educational goals? If the answer is no, then the student should be advised to apply elsewhere. Concern for fit should continue through a student's education. As students mature, their educational goals normally change. Sometimes this change is only slight; in other cases it may mean a total revamping of a student's academic program. The effectiveness of an institution's academic program is dependent on how accurately changes in the student's educational goals are identified and how carefully the student's academic program is adjusted to reflect these changes.

The keystone to this process is the quality of academic advice given to the student. Academic advising starts at the time a student applies for admission and continues until graduation; it involves not only faculty but student affairs staff and student peers. In short, academic advising is a complex process that continuously involves the entire campus.

In this Research Report, Thomas J. Grites, Director of Academic Advising at Stockton State College, has taken a comprehensive look at the academic advising process. After reviewing the historical developments, delivery systems, and interinstitutional interfacing of academic advising, Dr. Grites develops a set of eight recommendations that could be used by institutions as they assess their own advising programs.

Jonathan D. Fife, Director
ERIC® Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Contents

Overview 1

Historical Development 5
Attitudes 5
Definitions 8
Models 9

Delivery Systems 11
Faculty Advising 11
Advisement Centers 13
Peer/Paraprofessional Advising 14
Other Delivery Techniques 16
An Integrated Approach 18

Intrainstitutional Interfacing 20
Admissions and Retention 20
The Registrar 25
Student Affairs 26
The Faculty 30
Students 33
An Integrated Effort 39

Summary and Implications 41

Recommendations 46

Bibliography 55

Overview

Academic advising in American higher education has evolved from a routine, isolated, single-purpose, faculty activity to a comprehensive process of academic, career, and personal development performed by personnel from most elements of the campus community. This evolution has resulted from changing enrollment patterns, a new diversity of college students, increased student involvement in academic processes, and the recent economic and labor conditions of the country; it has been reflected in the attitudes toward advising, a changing definition of advising, and a limited number of theoretical models of advising.

The attitudinal changes toward advising have been stimulated by student concerns for more interpersonal campus relationships, by the need for better academic planning, and by the concern over increased attrition rates. A new definition describes academic advising as a *decision-making process during which students realize their maximum educational potential through communication and information exchanges with an advisor.* It is ongoing, multifaceted, and the responsibility of both student and advisor. The advisor serves as a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences, and a referral agent. Few theoretical models of this complex process exist; rather, descriptions of various advising delivery systems prevail in the literature.

The most common advising delivery systems include faculty advising, professional staff advisors in advisement centers, and peer or paraprofessional advising programs. Though most often criticized, faculty advising still prevails and should not be assumed ineffective. Where feasible, however, centralized advising efforts, utilizing faculty, staff, peer, and paraprofessional advisors to serve more students and those with special advising concerns, should be considered. Specialized techniques of delivery in academic advising include computer-assisted advising, self-advising, group advising, the use of advising contracts, and various outreach advising programs. These techniques are adaptable to any of the common delivery systems.

Attitudinal changes toward academic advising have resulted from the interface of many campus elements with this process and the cooperative effort that must be maintained among them. Academic advising begins with admissions recruitment when prospective students

are introduced to the total academic environment. Furthermore, advising enhances retention by providing students with a personal "bond" to the institution.

The advising and registration functions provide an effective interface through their concurrence, information exchanges, and their evaluation. These two processes must continually understand and support each other to realize mutual benefits.

The last administrative interface is consolidated under the rubric of student affairs. Though student affairs and academic affairs efforts historically have often conflicted, the advising process may well serve as the common element to resolve such conflict. Cooperative academic advising efforts have been successful in the areas of career development, orientation, residential living, and even personal counseling.

The most obvious interface in the advising program is with the faculty, primarily through development and implementation of the curriculum. Recent curricular innovations, such as flexible general education requirements, external degrees, and credit for life experience, have required more emphasis on quality advising. As a result faculty development programs have increased and have begun to include improvement of advising skills.

Whatever their context, these interfacing relationships with academic advising ultimately affect students. The college experience impacts on students' attitudes, self-concepts, and intellectual and interpersonal development, and academic advising could be the significant factor in their success or failure, their satisfaction or discontent, and their retention or attrition. Certain groups of students have shown somewhat unique advising needs; these include nontraditional (older) students, women and minority students, and undecided or exploratory students. Such concern is not, however, equated with an absence of student responsibility. One of the best outcomes of the college experience should be an acquired sense of responsibility and accountability for actions.

Three primary conclusions are drawn from this analysis of the available literature on academic advising. First, it is obvious that *advising cannot be done in isolation*. This process must be integrated among all constituents of the institution to make the best possible use of all fiscal, physical, and human resources. Second, *there is no single formula for a successful advising program*. Each institution and each advisor must decide on the appropriate approach to advise individual students. And third, *academic advising will play a more prominent*

role in the future of higher education. With declining enrollments, increasing costs, and predicted shortages in portions of the professional labor force, institutions will focus even more strongly on the recruitment and retention of students. Academic advising has proven effective in the latter and will be used as a total institutional process in the future.

To achieve the potential of the academic advising process, certain implications must not be overlooked. First, a complete understanding of this process is necessary; that is, a published institutional statement about advising must be clearly articulated, specific objectives must be formulated, and the institutional commitment to advising must be realized. Second, expert management of all institutional resources is essential. Revised budget and space allocations, new job descriptions, and more informal participatory governance and problem solving may be required. Finally, certain risks will need to be taken. The most critical of these involve hiring, salary negotiations, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Credit for good advising and the time required for providing it must be included in the institutional reward structure. This will be no easy task, and will be risky, but it is essential to the overall success of an advising program.

The final outcome of this research is a set of recommendations that each institution should review to determine the current status of its advising program. These are as follows:

(1) Conduct a thorough assessment study of the program's overall utility, relevance, and effectiveness.
(2) Identify one person whose primary responsibility is to coordinate the advising program.
(3) Implement an advisor selection process to minimize the percentage of failure the program must endure.
(4) Develop an advisor training program to insure confidence that the program will be effective.
(5) Develop an evaluation scheme that is both summative and formative and includes a variety of methods, evaluators, and criteria.
(6) Implement some type of extrinsic incentive or reward system to avoid the erosion of advising back to a perfunctory, unimportant, burdensome task.
(7) Review the total program every five years using similar methodologies developed through the first recommendation.
(8) Conduct more research on the advising process and its outcomes to generate new information about this process, to determine more

generalizable approaches, and to re-invent fewer wheels.

This report is a call to action for many of the ideas and concerns about academic advising that have been reported over the years. The suggestions herein are not only necessary but also quite possible with existing resources. Creativity, risk-taking, understanding, cooperation, and commitment are the key elements in this actualization process, which must be realized as higher education enters a decade of uncertainty.

Historical Development

Only recently has the academic advising process become a topic of concern in higher education. Historically, there had been little variation in this process—faculty told students what courses to take to meet the graduation requirements as specified in the college catalog. Today, however, this process is performed by a wide range of personnel, requires much more information, involves comprehensive academic and career planning, and influences almost every other institutional function.

This newly recognized concern is especially apparent in the numerous forums that have surfaced to discuss the intricacies of academic advising. Two National Conferences on Academic Advising have already occurred, and the third is planned; Regional Seminars have been offered by The American College Testing Program; various institutions have conducted local area conferences; many institutions have developed Task Forces, conducted workshops, or established committees to address their unique advising concerns and programs; and a new professional organization, The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), has been formed.

The current concern for academic advising took a long time to develop, since the status quo always seemed adequate. Certain turnabouts and conditions in higher education, however, stimulated changes in three primary areas: the attitudes toward advising, definitions, and models of the advising process.

Attitudes

The early days of American higher education presented no real need for a formalized advising structure since student bodies were small, course offerings limited, and programs rigid. College presidents and their faculties assumed this responsibility in an informal manner. Not until 1876 was the first system of faculty advisors, headed by a now-called Dean, formed at Johns Hopkins University. Harvard followed in 1889, and by 1940 almost every college and university had established some formal system of faculty academic advisement. After World War II these institutions experienced a tremendous growth in enrollments and in diversity of students. As a result most campuses developed student service programs in the noninstructional areas of

housing, financial aid, job placement, and counseling (DeLisle 1965; Appleton, Moore, and Vinton 1978).

Noticeably absent from the list of these new programs was the service known as academic advising because faculty felt that advising was a curricular, academic function that only they could perform. Today those responsible for advising programs are still associated with academic affairs rather than student affairs units by almost 4:1 (Carstensen 1979).

As enrollments continued to swell in the 1950's, faculty began to limit their energies toward advising. They became dissatisfied with the large numbers of advisees, the lack of time, space facilities, and information available for advising, the largely clerical tasks involved, and the absence of incentives or rewards for advising (DeLisle 1965; Borland and Birmingham 1977). Instead, they chose to involve themselves more with consultation and committee work, institutional governance, publishing and research. The use of more part-time faculty to meet enrollment demands resulted in high turnover and less concern for students as well (Upcraft 1971).

Just as the student unrest in the 1960's had an impact on many social mores and on other aspects of higher education, so did it have its effect on academic advising. Demands for freedom, relevance, and participation forced significant changes in the curriculum, especially in general education. No longer could advisors merely sign class cards; they now had to construct the general curriculum for each student. This responsibility required much more complete knowledge of available courses and student needs, interests, and abilities. At the same time, however, these same faculty were required to develop new programs and courses to meet curricular demands, conduct more research, and publish more (Borland 1973; Pino 1975).

Beyond the direct curriculum demands, two other outcomes of the 1960's, which affected attitudes toward the advising process, are still evident today: student evaluations of teaching and the overall student consumer movement in higher education. With student evaluations of teaching now used in promotion and tenure decisions, faculty had good reason to concentrate their efforts in the classroom rather than in the office as an advisor. Out-of-class time was better spent with students from the class, even at the expense of assigned advisees.

Students also began to indicate their concern for a more relevant and personal education. During the late 1950's they were interested in intellectual relationships, but the 1960's generated more concern for interpersonal relationships. The student consumer movement

articulated the lack of personal experiences, especially with faculty; academic advising could have fostered such relationships (Betz, Starr, and Menne 1972; Bevilacqua 1976; Palladino and Tryon 1978).

The 1970's brought about new attitudes toward academic advising. The unfortunate reasons for this change were the economic and labor conditions of the country and the sharply increased attrition of college students.

As enrollments began to decline and operating costs markedly increased during the 1970's, colleges and universities were faced with severe budgetary crises. Reduced tuition income, coupled with increased costs for energy, equipment, and employees, forced administrators to manage their declining resources with much more scrutiny. Simultaneously, the supply of faculty members increased, tenure quotas were established, and more collective bargaining agreements were negotiated. These conditions would appear to have diverted fiscal resources and faculty interests away from the advising process. However, student conditions have somewhat outweighed these faculty and institutional conditions.

Student attrition, or the more positive concept, student retention, has become a primary focus of administrators in the mid-to-late 1970's. The concept is simple: the more students who remain in the institution, the fewer must be recruited from a shrinking pool. The resolution, however, is not so simple.

An even more diversified student body now attends our institutions. Unemployed Vietnam veterans, socioeconomically disadvantaged students who often lack the necessary skills for success in college, older adults, and other "nontraditional" students are enrolling in much greater numbers. For most of these students the college atmosphere is very threatening, and their retention potential is low. Even the more typical college students exhibit a relatively low retention potential. Most of these students are undecided about curriculum pursuits, question their employment potential upon graduation, and transfer schools.

The advising process, in which these students have individual contacts with a variety of institutional representatives, has been recognized as an important mechanism for retaining students. Advisors can minimize the threat to nontraditional students and reduce the uncertainty of others through their own knowledge and concern, and through referrals to other campus service agencies. The net effect of such relationships is increased retention and possibly survival.

The threshold of the 1980's suggests a continuation of the economic characteristics and of the attitudes toward academic advising as developed in the 1970's, except that they will be more emphatic. Operational costs are sure to rise; the number of high school graduates will decrease; undergraduate enrollments will decline in four-year institutions; baccalaureate degrees will begin to decline while graduate and professional degrees will increase; and full-time faculty positions will decrease (*Chronicle* 1978; Centra 1979). The combination of these conditions will result in keener competition for students, for job security of faculty and staff, and for all sources of monies. Institutions will be forced to concentrate on the quality of education they provide to face this competition. Advising will help provide this quality as a competitive means to attract and retain students, to recognize faculty and staff contributions, and to make the best possible use of resources.

Definitions

Just as the attitudes toward academic advising changed very little until the 1950's, the general concept of advising showed little change. Until this time advising was merely seen as a prescriptive, administrative activity, whereby faculty approved certain courses for students to take. During the time of redirected faculty activity, however, the advising process was likened to teaching because of its relation to academic, educational, and career involvement and to the communications processes involved (Robertson 1958; Crookston 1972).

With more emphasis on interpersonal relationships during the 1960's, advising was perceived as more of a counseling function. Advisors, mostly faculty, were expected to show more concern for students and to develop closer relationships with them. Neither faculty nor counselors were receptive to these expectations; this probably contributed to the growing rift between faculties and the relatively new student service programs (Borland 1978).

The 1970's, however, necessitated cooperative efforts among all constituencies of higher education to address students' psychological development, social responsibility, and occupational futures. These efforts have resulted in a new developmental advising definition or concept and advisor role. Academic advising is now described as a decisionmaking process during which students clear up certain confusion and realize their maximum educational potential and benefits through communication and information exchanges with an advisor; it is ongoing, multifaceted, and the responsibility of both student and advisor. The advisor serves as a facilitator of communication, a co-

ordinator of learning experiences through course and career planning and academic progress review, and an agent of referral to other campus agencies as necessary (Hardee 1970; Kramer and Gardner 1977; Crockett 1978; Walsh 1979). This definition reflects the current attitudes toward advising, and seems appropriate to launch us into the complexities of higher education in the 1980's.

Models

Although attitudes and the definitions of advising underwent some changes, the same basic model of simple course advising prevailed until the 1970's. With a more complex approach to advising, however, new models have appeared. An important distinction made here is that models of academic advising are theoretical or functional in nature, they are *not* simply descriptions of ways in which advising is delivered.

The first formal academic advising model was O'Banion's (1972). He suggested that advising became a logical, integrated sequence of events including: the exploration of life and vocational goals, program and course choices, and course scheduling. He recommended a team approach for the delivery of this service, using faculty, counselors, and students.

Although he never called it a model, Crookston (1972) described academic advising as a teaching function. Both reflect personal and vocational decisionmaking and facilitation of the student's rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavioral awareness, and problemsolving, decisionmaking, and evaluation skills (p. 12). The advisor, as teacher, stimulates a positive, shared, active approach to both intellectual and interpersonal learning activities in this model.

Two recent advising models were presented in a functional matrix format. The 4" x 4" model (Grites 1977) is organized according to certain operational functions of advising. These primary, professional, personal, and programmatic advising functions occur during the preview, planning, process, and postview developmental advising stages. Titley's (1978) model is organized according to levels of decisionmaking and types of student needs. She described characteristics of each of the emergentive, innovative, inventive, productive, and expressive levels of decisionmaking as they affect each of the intellectual, emotional, social, physical, and spiritual needs of students. Both authors recommend a variety of personnel to implement their models.

Various enhancements, which are readily adaptable to these basic

advisement models, have been suggested. Alternative managerial schemes and new professional roles are the most evident of these (Brown 1972; Chickering 1973; Kramer and Gardner 1977; Mash forthcoming). As institutions review their advisement programs for the 1980's these models and enhancements need to be studied. As new theoretical approaches are developed, a variety of delivery systems will be examined. These systems are described in the next chapter.

Just as classroom instruction is provided through lecture, discussion, and laboratory methods, and just as research is conducted with experimental, survey, and Delphi techniques, academic advising is also provided in a variety of ways. This chapter describes the relative effectiveness of methods by which advising is provided.

Faculty Advising

Student-faculty interaction has long been revered as an integral part of higher education. The instructional faculty have been the primary providers of academic services; 79 percent of the advising programs currently use this mode (Carstensen 1979). Consequently, many efforts have been undertaken to maximize the relationships between faculty and students. Bess (1978) presented a model for such interaction requiring constant facilitation of congruence between student and faculty needs and dispositions.

Feldman and Newcomb (1969) concluded that faculty relationships influenced student intellectual development, career decisionmaking, and graduate or professional school planning, especially when complemented and reinforced by peer influences. The most convincing support comes from Astin's (1977) conclusion in his longitudinal study of student development:

> Student-faculty interaction has a stronger relationship to student satisfaction with the college experience than any other involvement variable or, indeed, any other student or institutional characteristic. Students who interact frequently with faculty are more satisfied with all aspects of their institutional experience, including student friendships, variety of courses, intellectual environment, and even administration of the institution. Finding ways to encourage greater personal contact between faculty and students might increase students' satisfaction with their college experiences (p. 223).

He further found that such satisfaction is consistent across most student variables and characteristics; therefore, it is the faculty member who determines the satisfying relationship.

Recognizing Alberti's (1972) caution about the assumption that *any* faculty contact with students is good and Hallberg's (1964) directive that such interaction must be planned, the academic advising relationship still seems appropriate to impart faculty influence. The

interaction is delicately balanced between not-so-strong-a-concern for academic standards as to smother a close student-faculty relationship and not so intimate as to undermine academic expectations (Gamson 1967). Unfortunately, most faculty advising systems are based on the assumption that this means is the most economic and feasible; these assumptions have not always held true.

Some interesting paradoxes exist in the assessment of the effectiveness of faculty advisors. For example, Evans and Neagley (1973) provide some of the same reasons for *including* as for *excluding* faculty in community college advisement, i.e., interest, knowledge, and the time available for advising. Although they have indicated the advising role as a nonrelevant function, faculty have perceived themselves as effective and satisfied in this role (Donk and Oetting 1968; Biggs, Brodie, and Barnhart 1975; Borgard, Hornbuckle, and Mahoney 1977).

Students have contradicted their patterns of seeking assistance from faculty advisors. Coyle (1971) found that students chose instructors, even if they were not advisors, as their first source of help in five academic problem areas; yet Dilley (1967) found that many students preferred not to contact faculty, even when they were available. Other studies showed that students went to their instructors and advisors for academic problems in their early years, but later went to "no one." Upperclassmen tended to seek academic assistance from faculty they knew rather than assigned advisors (Donk and Oetting 1967, 1968; Fahsbender 1970; Towner 1975).

A final paradox is seen in the generalized claim that faculty advising is ineffective. Although many studies showed that students were dissatisfied with their advising, most studies that concluded faculty advising was ineffective were done as direct comparisons. As indicated below, peer advisors, professional staff advisors, counselors, and graduate students were all more effective than faculty advisors when compared directly. Although faculty advising should be used as the benchmark for assessing the effectiveness of other advising systems, the results of direct comparison studies are obvious.

However, results of direct comparison studies are certain to disfavor faculty. The faculty advisor is expected to teach, publish, do research, keep abreast of developments within the discipline, and still confer with numerous advisees (and other students) about liberal arts education, life goals, course selections, career plans, graduation requirements, advanced study, academic progress, study habits, extracurricular activities, personal concerns, and employment outlooks.

Nonfaculty advisors are usually concerned exclusively with the advising process and often only portions of it.

One must be cautious not to generalize about the inadequacy of faculty advising. This age-old concept has yet to be shown intrinsically ineffective and should not be discarded; rather, faculty advising should be considered for its effectiveness, especially as it is coordinated with other delivery systems.

Advisement Centers

During the late 1950's and 1960's two new delivery systems were introduced. The first was the establishment of the central advisement center, which really came about in response to the swelling enrollments and lessened faculty interest in advising *rather than* as a concern for student welfare, as most assume (Baxter 1971).

The community colleges pioneered a centralized concept through the use of counseling center personnel. However, counselors became more interested in student psychological concerns and less comfortable in the prescriptive advising role. As a result the advisement center evolved. It is usually headed by a professional staff advisor whose primary functions are to understand and use the intricacies of instructional systems to facilitate student academic progress. Additional advisors have included faculty, other professional staff, counselors, and/or students. The center itself becomes a readily available repository of information, a monitor of developing student concerns, an internal referral and support system, and a "home" for many types of students. The campus-wide advisement center concept has been extended to individual schools and colleges on many larger university campuses (Jones 1968; Burns and Kishler 1972; Pino 1975; Siewert 1975; Polson and Jurich 1979).

Advisement centers have been especially responsive to the growing number of "undecided," "undeclared," or "exploratory" students. These students, because of their uncertainty, are less appealing to faculty advisors and are more prone to withdrawal and overall dissatisfaction with their college lives. The advisement center has provided a designated location where such students can receive more intensive advising with respect to goal setting, career exploration, and decisionmaking (Bonar and Mahler 1976; Trombley 1979). Other types of students often served by advisement centers include all new freshmen, whether undecided or not, dismissed or probationary students, and nondegree students.

Student perceptions of advising, attitudes toward advisors, and accuracy in registration have been reported as positive outcomes of a

centralized approach (Shelton 1972; Pino 1975). Specific centralized programs, which have demonstrated this effectiveness and which the reader might consult for possible adaptions, are described in Crockett (1978, 1979).

The centralized advising concept, which grew out of numeric necessity, has become one of the most viable and effective means of providing academic advising in the last twenty years. The original concept has changed, however, to a more comprehensive one that will probably be expanded even more in the future.

Peer/Paraprofessional Advising

College students have used other students most often when seeking sources of assistance in achieving their independence and in developing their self-images (Feldman and Newcomb 1969; Upcraft 1971). To capitalize on this influence, the "peer helper" concept has been used in orientation, residence halls, tutoring, counseling, and in academic advising.

As a complement to both faculty and centralized advising systems, the use of peer and other paraprofessional advisors is the second delivery system that has flourished in recent years. Carstensen (1979) reported that 31 percent of the nation's advising programs use peer advisors to support the primary mode of advising services, 25 percent use residence hall staff, and 11 percent use other nonprofessional/paraprofessional personnel.

Though most programs use undergraduate students to serve truly as "peer" advisors to other undergraduates, several variations are noteworthy. Montes and Ortega (1976) developed a peer modeling system for nontraditional students that provides emotional, academic, and social assistance in meeting their needs. King (1979) developed a part-time paraprofessional advising program at Ocean County (community) College using retired persons from the community, housewives, and evening advisors who were elsewhere employed during the day. These advisors completed a self-paced training program, conducted a summer Freshman Orientation Program, and continued individual advising through the freshman year. The use of paraprofessionals, rather than peers, may be especially appropriate in the two-year college to maintain continuity. Koloc, Burns, and Luedde (1978) used graduate students, who were employed for two years, carefully selected, extensively trained, and rigorously evaluated, in an advising center at the University of Pittsburgh.

Beyond the obvious attempts to reduce the numbers of advisees per advisor, certain other advantages of peer and paraprofessional advising have been advanced. Faculty advisor time is reserved for more in-depth advising; the costs are relatively minimal, as many perform as volunteers; students have more credibility with other students in terms of language, attitudes, and understandings of the college environment; their dedication and enthusiasm are immeasurable assets to the institution; channels of communication among students, faculty, and administrators are improved; and it provides students with a leadership experience. These advantages seem to outweigh the potential disadvantages of additional training and supervision, rapid turnover, and the students' obligations to their own academic programs (Bonar and Mahler 1976; Parker 1976; Brown 1977).

Evidence that the above outcomes are indeed achieved through peer and paraprofessional advising programs is adequate. Students rated peer or paraprofessional advisors significantly higher than faculty advisors on the human interest variables of quality of the advising relationship, advisee satisfaction, and academic attitude. Furthermore, faculty advisors were satisfied with such assistance and were able to reduce their own clerical and administrative tasks, and peer advisors have also been effective in reducing the dropout rate, improving study skills, and producing higher grades (Upcraft 1971; Murry 1972; Baldwin 1975; Brown and Myers 1975; Brown 1977).

On the other hand, Zultowski and Catron (1976) found no significant effects in GPA, attrition, selection of courses or class loads, use of college resources, satisfaction with the college experience, or attitude when student advisors were used; they cautioned that peer advisors mostly provide subjective and experiential advice.

To achieve the outcomes expressed above, certain criteria for selecting peer advisors have been prescribed. The most desirable characteristics include the ability to relate to other students, faculty, and administrators, problemsolving ability, knowledge of campus policies, procedures, facilities, and resources, a strong sense of responsibility, reliability, and energy, above-average academic ability, and thoughtfulness in their own academic planning (Upcraft 1971; Crockett 1978).

The use of peer/paraprofessional advisors is increasing and is generally successful. With similar precautions as necessary in faculty and centralized advising programs, the use of peers/paraprofessionals should be studied for its value in the overall advising program.

Other Delivery Techniques

A variety of other methods exists for enhancing the three basic advising delivery systems described above. These methods provide various ways in which faculty, professional staff, and peer or paraprofessional advisors can improve their advising skills. The most common techniques are described below.

Computer-Assisted Advising—Though limited to basic course scheduling, the use of computer-generated information has proven both practical and efficient in academic advising. Some of the specific uses of this technique include verification of graduation requirements, identification of students in academic difficulty, demographic and course information retrieval, and even the prediction of academic success. The obvious advantage to this technique is the rapid gathering, compilation, updating, and delivery of data, as well as in determining course demands, grade trends, and transcript and advising errors. In addition it provides a relief from certain repetitious advising tasks and the ability to accommodate more students in less time. Most authors offer this technique as an effective supplement, and not a replacement, for direct personal advising (Juola, Winburne, and Whitmore 1968; Vitulli and Singleton 1972; Hadley 1976).[1]

Self-Advisement—One outcome of the complete information provided through computer-assisted advising has been that students are better able to advise themselves with respect to course selections. The economy of time is obvious.

Although self-advisement techniques have most often been directly compared to other specific techniques, the evidence is favorable. Self-advised students committed fewer enrollment errors, especially when a handbook and/or personal assistance were available (Recer 1969; Lewis 1972).

Some students are able to complete all course requirements without advisor assistance, and indeed a certain amount of self-advisement should be encouraged as a stimulus for more student responsibility in decisionmaking. This is not to suggest, however, the weakening of the advisor role; rather, it is strengthened. Self-advisement might even result in better advisor performance, since students will come to the advising session better prepared to receive advice. Such preparation does depend on the availability and clarity of written materials, such as catalogs, class schedules, handbooks, and curriculum guides.

---

[1]The reader is referred to Spencer et al. (1976), Aitken and Conrad (1977), Crockett (1978), and Pommrehn (1978) for specific examples of effective computer-assisted programs and materials.

Group Advising—Another economy-of-time technique, although not used as extensively as one would expect, is group advising. Regularized group advising avoids repetition of common information, demonstrates the similarity of students' concerns, facilitates investigation of specific facts, encourages consideration of various class schedules and career options, and can save money (Katz 1973; Bonar and Mahler 1976; McCusker and Osterlund 1979).

Most research on this technique has been in group counseling, and especially with low-ability, high-risk, and probationary students, rather than in group academic advising. The findings indicate that group counseling techniques can produce effective results in retention, increased GPA, academic and personal adjustment, and changes in personality characteristics in such students, but the evidence is not overwhelmingly conclusive. Specific to group academic advising, positive results have been found in student and faculty satisfaction with advising, in more appropriate course selection, and in increased retention (Lewis 1972; Hutchins and Miller 1979).

Such success need not be limited to students, however. Groups of advisors might meet with some of their advisees to complement each other in sharing information, suggestions, and interpretations.

Advising Contracts—The advising process may be only a part of a larger contract that each student has with the institution. By accepting an offer of admission the student agrees to pay certain fees for services to demonstrate certain academic performance so as to be retained and eventually graduated, and to abide by certain social rules and regulations. Some institutions offer complete degree programs in which the student's entire curriculum is contracted separately from published requirements.

In the context of everyday academic advising, however, the use of contracts has been limited. Kramer and Gardner (1977) described the advising contract as a *negotiated* agreement between student and advisor that includes a shared definition of what is to be accomplished, the principal duties of each party, and the procedures to be used to monitor, evaluate, or change that relationship (p. 26). It specifies the goals and limits of the relationship, the available resources for both parties, a review schedule, and might include a visual planning model. Contracts can be used in planning the long-term advising relationship or for more specific aspects, e.g., having the undecided student take an interest inventory, having the uninvolved student participate in an activity, or having the failing student find study skills or tutoring assistance.

Although no specific research is available on the success of this advising technique, its use with probationary students and minority students has been suggested (Barlow and Wright 1976; Nieves 1977).

Outreach Efforts.—The above advising schemes normally occur in the confines of the advisor's office. Some advising programs, in assuming a more proactive role, have been extended to other parts of the campus and beyond.

On the campus such efforts have included direct mailings and artistic posters encouraging students to be advised, "problem centers" during peak advising periods, and live-in advisors in residence halls. Stein and Spille (1974) reported a doubling of advisor in-office appointments, reduced student procrastination and more informal student-advisor interaction as a result of "hallway advising" in strategic student traffic locations.

Off the campus these efforts have included articulation advising in "feeder" community colleges (Grites and Teague 1978), community-based educational counseling for adults across an entire state (Thompson and Jensen 1977), and a Mobile Advisement Center in the worst ghetto communities of Los Angeles (Dyste 1970). Each of these programs has perceived benefits in enrollments and attitudes toward the institution.

An Integrated Approach

As shown above, a variety of institutional personnel and methods can be used to provide effective academic advising. The obvious questions for deans, directors, and vice presidents are: Which delivery system is best for my campus? for my students? for my advisors? The answer must be: Whatever works best. And this is not a cliché.

The key to a successful delivery system will be determining the best combination for each individual institution, advisor, and indeed each individual student. Where a single type of advisor is used, perhaps some of the enhancement techniques need to be employed. Where a combination of personnel is used, the same techniques might be attempted through a team approach.

The important determinant is the *integration* of personnel and techniques. No singular, isolated advising approach can provide all students with assistance in all academic, vocational, personal/social, and administrative matters. Rather than attempting to provide the same advisement for all students, alternative advising schemes should be encouraged. An integrated approach is a must; the information in

this chapter provides an "awareness bank" from which to select and develop one's own efficient and effective advising delivery system.

Intrainstitutional Interfacing

Academic advising has recently been realized as a process that influences or is affected by each major entity on the campus. This chapter provides an analysis of these interfacing relationships and the relative consequences of each. The first three relationships concern administrative units.

Admissions and Retention

An analysis of the impacts involving the advising process begins with the student's initial experience with the institution, i.e., through admission. Not only does advising begin at this point, but so also does the retention of these students. It is necessary, then, to examine simultaneously the interfacing relationship of the advising process with both admission and retention efforts.

Admissions—The strength of an admissions program is often measured by the number of students recruited. Attractive brochures, multimedia spectacles, campus open houses, traveling road shows, frisbees, T-shirts, and other gimmicks are all proven techniques for publicizing the institution and increasing applications. There are, however, certain limitations of the recruitment process that must be realized to maximize retention. These limitations include: the overall pool of candidates, the characteristics of these candidates, and the approaches used to attract them.

First, there is little question that the number of first-time students will continue to decline during the 1980's. The 18-to-21-year-old population will decrease by 11 percent by 1985 and more thereafter; contrary to popular assumptions, the older student population will *decrease* by 8 or 9 percent by 1985; a weak job market, inflation, migration, tax limitations, and a projected increase in military recruiting will further contribute to this decline (Centra 1979; New Jersey 1979). One beneficial outcome is that more institutions will have the opportunity to concentrate on the quality of education they provide for their students (Centra 1979, p. 62). One way to concentrate on this quality is to attract the right students.

Second, recruitment efforts have too often been concentrated on *quantities* of students. But to increase retention and to concentrate on the quality of education, more emphasis must now be placed on

the *qualities* of these students. These qualities are not measured solely by test scores, grade-point averages, and class rank, but also by such criteria as their admission status, financial ability, attitudes, and perceptions.

Various studies have indicated the value in such assessment. Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) identified seven noncognitive variables used to predict the success or diagnose potential problem areas for minority students. Yale (1978) observed that more transfer students are being admitted, yet transfers historically drop out more often than full-time entering freshmen. Huddleston and Weibe (1978) determined the relative cost-effectiveness of competing admissions efforts through a market segments analysis. A similar strategy resulted in a 10-percent transfer student enrollment increase (Leister and MacLachlan 1976). Hadley (1977, 1978) reported several studies concerning "readmitted" students. They were more likely to return the longer they had originally been in attendance, tended to return to the same type of institution, and earned higher grades the longer they were delayed reentry.

Admissions efforts also should assess the group of students that has been fully admitted but fails to attend. Reasons for nonattendance have included untimely financial-aid decisions, institutional size, lack of housing, and impersonalization, some of which may be perceived rather than real (Hadley 1977; Grites and Teague 1978; Brown 1979). Other characteristics that might be reviewed include whether the institution is the student's first choice, the institution's perceived academic reputation relative to competing schools, and the student's own expected satisfaction, academic success, and retention (*Chronicle* 1979). With complete knowledge of the student market, more effective recruitment approaches can be devised.

The third admissions limitation is in the type of recruitment approach used. One type might be called the "Madison Avenue" approach. It is decidedly a marketing scheme designed to sell a competitive product to as many buyers as can be accommodated. This approach might be successful in securing new enrollments, but will likely not succeed in retaining those enrollments unless the product is of quality.

A better way to recruit would be through the "best fit" approach. This approach uses the information on student characteristics described above to seek out and admit those students whose potential for matriculation and graduation are the greatest. Such an approach necessitates clearly articulated institutional values, preferences, instructional ethos, living conditions, personalized attention, and even

weaknesses (Cope and Hannah 1975; Morstain 1977; Huddleston and Weibe 1978; Yale 1978). Brown (1979) found that such "matching" was the main discriminator in students' decisions to enroll.

Probably the best approach is the "truth-in-advertising" concept. Students, as consumers of educational services, are entitled to a fair investment return when they accept an offer of admission. Institutions have the responsibility to help students become more sophisticated shoppers by providing comparative information regarding access to the institution, processes affecting students, and the outcomes of the educational experience (Titterington 1978).

Whether the information is printed, set to music, on film, or merely spoken, can it be delivered? Are the courses and programs really available? Does the student body really represent all 50 states and numerous foreign countries? Is financial aid really available? Are all those trees, lakes, tennis courts, and parking spaces really there? Are graduates really being employed? Do advisors really help students? If the answer to any of these questions is "No," then prospective students should be so informed. When the institution does not have the necessary capacity, when it lacks competence on the faculty, when it lacks critical facilities or other resources and has no access to them, then it must be candid about its limitations (Chickering 1973, p. 75).

What is the role of academic advising in the admissions scheme? The advising process cannot increase the candidate pool, but it can help assess student and institutiinal characteristics to provide prospective students with assurance that their needs, interests, and abilities are congruent with what the institution has to offer. Two steps seem critical in this assessment.

The first step is to include advising personnel in the recruitment process. Admissions counselors are able to provide a wide range of campus-wide information, but they cannot be expected to interpret the policies of each academic unit. When possible, advisors should accompany admissions personnel to clarify such policies and opportunities and simply do their own recruiting.

The next step deals with the content of the information provided. There appears to be a serious omission from the information provided to prospective students before, during, and even after recruitment. School counselors write recommendations and complete application forms; admissions counselors provide housing, financial aid, and admissions information; orientation personnel help students find the library, the Student Union, and other resources; academic advisors

assist with registration and course selections. But rarely in any of these contacts is the student confronted with the social and psychological adjustment realities of the complex college environment: potential isolation and loneliness, a new sense of responsibility, keener academic competition, and possible failures in courses, career choices, and social activities. Retention figures, grade distributions, number of changes in majors, and traffic volume to the counseling center should also be shared with new students (Smith 1978; Grites in press).

The Carnegie Council (1979) has reported on the institutional and student rights and responsibilities that begin to address these issues through academic programming and admissions. Special mention was made of the Better Information Project in eleven pilot institutions where such omissions were being corrected.

The academic advising process can assist the admissions effort in an educative way. In this manner the admissions process becomes a "recruitment for retention" effort.

Retention—There is little question that institutions need to reenroll as many successfully recruited students as possible. There is also little question that some students will leave; the task is to minimize that attrition. To do so the institution needs to be aware of the kinds of students who leave.

The earliest and most common term for students who left institutions was simply "dropout." Astin (1975) described the limits of this definition and investigated the "stopout" concept, whereby a student reentered higher education after an absence. Although "stopping out" is considered a healthy, developmental move for many students, Astin's (1975) longitudinal research indicated it did not enhance retention. He found that over 90 percent of the students usually left college for negative reasons, such as boredom, finances, or poor grades, and suggested that simple acceptance of this concept could be a rationalization for not confronting the limitations of the institution.

Yale (1978) described three types of attrition. "Developmental" attrition is similar to the "stopout" concept, in that students leave because of new objectives. "Bad fit" attrition is the antithesis of the "best fit" recruitment described above; in this case the student might have had unrealistic expectations or the institution might not have clearly represented itself. "Correctable" attrition is the type on which institutions must concentrate to improve retention rates. If such attrition is prevented, the student's graduation objectives as well as the institution's educational goals and resource conservation are facili-

tated. To realize an institution's retention potential the factors contributing to correctable attrition must be understood.

Noel (1976) cited the four basic causes for attrition as isolation, academic boredom, dissonance, and irrelevance, which are especially evidenced in marginal ability and "undecided" students. A strong influence on leaving is inadequate academic and career progress, which might be attributed to one's academic ability, academic achievement, academic adjustment, or academic attitude (Brown 1977). Certain nonacademic reasons, especially a lack of involvement in campus life, also influence students' decisions to leave (Pervin and Rubin 1967; Starr, Betz, and Menne 1972; Astin 1977). Not to be overlooked is the fact that 1.6 percent of the 1978-79 college freshmen *expected* to fail one or more courses, and 2 percent *expected* to drop out either temporarily or permanently *(Chronicle* 1979).

The critical step in the retention effort is how the institution elects to achieve its retention goal. Academic advising should be examined for its contribution to that goal. Smith (1978) suggested that even with good teaching and a good admissions fit, the student still needs to find a "bond" to the institution. An important bond is the personal relationship with a faculty member through the advising process. Noel (1976) and Shulman (1976) cited the presence of a "significant adult" on campus as an influential figure on students who stayed. And Yale (1978) reported that 72 percent of the dissatisfied students who left still valued their conversations with faculty and deans.

The advising process, then, is important to retention. Newman (1965) reported that dropouts perceived their advisors as unavailable, disinterested, and unhelpful twice as often as did those who graduated. Hadley (1976) reported considerable improvement in retention and better-than-expected academic performance for exit-prone students assigned to a specially trained team of faculty advisors. As a survival mechanism, the Retention Committee of students, faculty, and staff at Tusculum College reduced attrition by providing personal contacts with students who were contemplating leaving (Scher 1979). Glennen (1976) reported the most inclusive and impressive results using an intrusive advising approach. He observed a 39 percent reduction in freshman attrition, a 9 percent increase in the dean's list, over 300 fewer students on academic probation or suspension, increased FTE's, and fewer courses dropped. A similar approach and results were reported by Myers, et al. (1979) through the Retention Advising Program.

Other programs related to advising have also been successful in

the retention effort by preventing academic disaster and promoting academic rehabilitation. Hadley (1978) reported positive retention results from a variety of orientation programs. From a counseling perspective retention was increased when a strong counselor or commitment to curricular change was evident (Marks, Ashby, and Noll 1966); educational attitudes were improved and academic anxieties reduced through a learning counseling technique (Garfield and McHugh 1978). However, Gelso and Thompson (1970) suggested that brief mid-term emergency counseling may be too late; therefore, the academic advisor needs to become more acutely aware of potential academic difficulties.

From an instructional perspective, Algier (1972) described a multifaceted learning laboratory, which resulted in the readmission of half the dismissed students in the program. The Thirteen College Curriculum Program provided separate experiential teaching approaches for black students with average nonverbal abilities but who fell below national norms on traditional tests; a 15 percent better retention rate resulted (Shulman 1976).

Most of the literature on retention, however, reflects a basic deficiency. The varied programs, efforts, profiles, and data tend to focus on the negative, i.e., the student who has already left or is predicted to leave the institution. A more positive emphasis might be placed on studying those students who are inclined to stay and, therefore, make the admissions and retention efforts more compatible. Again, the advising relationship might be the mechanism to achieve this.

The academic advisor is the natural resource to make use of both the affective and cognitive determinations cited above. As advisors find out more about student involvement, commitment, and course selections, they will, in turn, become "significant adults"; as they become apprised of and gather certain information about their students, they will be better able to provide the kind of assistance needed to improve retention. The academic advisor is an integral component of admission and retention programs, and such a resource should not be left unused, since those who are not working for retention are, in fact, working against it.

The Registrar

No matter what theoretical approach is attempted, or what delivery system is employed, academic advising always peaks during registration and schedule adjustment periods. These two processes will always be linked together temporally.

The interfacing relationship between the registrar's office and academic advising is exhibited primarily through an information exchange. The important information normally provided by the registrar includes transfer credit evaluations, credits and grades earned, current class schedules, and course offerings for the next term. These must be provided in an accurate and timely manner for the advisor to be effective. On the other hand, (faculty) advisors determine transfer credit (curricular) policies, course values, grades, class adjustments (adds), and future course offerings. The relationship is one of continuous exchange, and often circular. The registrar provides information; the advisor uses it; the registrar confirms that use through verification of graduation requirements.

This interfacing relationship is further exemplified in evaluation procedures. It is entirely possible that student perceptions of one process are reflective of the other, i.e., students might perceive advising and registration as the same process, and an evaluation of one might really reflect the evaluation of the other.

Whatever the institutional approach, both the advising program and the registrar's functions must complement each other. The more each understands and supports the other, the better served and more satisfied the students.

Student Affairs

The interfacing of various student affairs offices with those of academic deans and faculty is essential to better student services and information. These two constituencies, however, have not been without conflict. Mutual suspicion, distrust, ignorance, lack of cooperation, and even hostility with faculty arose during the period of significant student personnel professional growth (Robertson 1958).

The responsibility for academic advising, a process affected by both constituencies, is also conflicting. Bevilacqua (1976) proposed that a student affairs leader, the dean of students acting as a student consumer advocate, serves as a catalyst/consultant in curricular planning and academic advising; but Appleton, Moore and Vinton (1978) recommended an assistant dean for student affairs in each academic unit be responsible for all student-related programming and problemsolving. It is obvious the two cannot work in isolation. Just as faculty cannot be mere advancers of a single discipline without affecting their students' personal lives, neither can student affairs professionals expect to develop students independent of their academic lives. Where faculty have primary responsibility for academic advis-

ing this should be viewed positively; any suggestion that student affairs professionals can advise better will only create an arrogant resistance and is doomed to failure (Mash forthcoming). Perhaps Casey's (1968) summative statement is still appropriate: The extent to which faculty can become a potent and viable source of student aid is directly proportional to the energy, direction, and enthusiasm that is provided by the student personnel staff (p. 376) and vice-versa. In this way both constituencies can become more equally involved in the professional activities of research and publication, as well as more equally responsible for student welfare (Hale 1973).

To create and support this integrative effort the student development concept has been advanced. As college students enter a new environment, seek to establish their autonomy and identity, and learn to develop their intellectual and interpersonal skills, they need all the assistance they can get. This assistance cannot be provided by one person, office, or unit on the campus; only a cooperative academic and student affairs effort will result in better educated, more satisfied students. Collaborative goalsetting, educational programming, resource identification and use, communication, assessment, and accountability are requisite to this effort (Brown 1972; Miller and Prince 1976). The areas of student affairs in which such collaboration has occurred are described below.

Career Development—Due to the labor market, enrollment, and budgetary constraints, institutions have been forced to provide better career planning assistance for their students. Since a key decision in career development is the choice of an academic major, the major academic advisor has much influence on the student's vocational future. Goodson (1978) found that students are almost equally divided in choosing a major or a specific occupation first. He described the advisor's role as making students aware of their choice patterns, assessing their career choices, and assisting them to select classes that will strengthen those choices. Baumgardner and Rappoport (1974) found that advisors view career choice more analytically than students, who choose careers according to personal feelings and commitment. Advisors need to be aware of these disparities to facilitate successful career choices.

The career development of liberal arts students is especially critical. Liberal arts graduates have mastered various conceptual and communication skills, but their marketability has diminished. The College Placement Council (1975) reported that most employers would be hiring less than 10 percent of liberal arts graduates unless

they had some related work, co-op, or intern experience. The Council called for more cooperation among institutions, employers, the government, and students for career planning in the liberal arts. The liberal arts advisor must recognize the applicability of electives and practical experiences that will facilitate job entry upon graduation (Berdie 1975; College Placement Council 1975).

The success of coordinated academic advising and career development efforts has been noted. Conyne and Cochran (1973) described an intervention process in which counselors assisted faculty to include educational and career goals in their advising. Gelwick (1974) found faculty enthusiastic about a training program designed to provide students better career advising with respect to vocational interests, women's career patterns and attitudes, and career resources. Other cooperative academic and career advising approaches and materials were reported by Hale (1973, 1974), Arnette (1974), and Crockett (1978).

Since students expect a college education to provide career options and opportunities, the academic and career advising relationships can only become more interdependent. The academic advisor serves to create and develop the interdependence.

Counseling—Since emotional needs usually supercede intellectual ones, those involved with the academic development of students must also be cognizant of their social, personal, and emotional development. Students often need assistance in coping with the stressful college environment. Though academic advisors cannot be expected to serve as therapists, they should become more aware of certain behaviors and conditions that suggest student psychological concerns and of appropriate referral sources. A consultative relationship with counselors will provide advisors with this necessary awareness and will eventually reduce clinical loads and better identify institutional causes of student difficulties (Ivey 1962; Kopplin and Rice 1975; Siewert 1975).

Some of the behaviors and conditions that advisors can most easily learn to identify include over- and underactivity, emotional variability, physical discomforts, tension-reducing habits, and changes in attitude (Crockett 1978). Beyond this recognition skill, advisors are able to learn the basic counseling skills of listening, nonverbal communication, and referral.

The interfacing of academic advisors with counseling personnel and services, then, is compatible with total student development. Intellectual and emotional needs may be interrelated, and to service

them in isolation would not be in the best interest of students, counselors, or advisors.

Orientation—After students have been admitted and before they begin their first classes most institutions provide some kind of orientation program for new students. These programs range from simple campus tours to lengthy workshops and may or may not include academic advising.

The more recent summer and fall orientation programs have been designed to help students explore educational programs, discover institutional resources, and begin to build an identification with the institution. Through these programs students are able to determine what systems operate in the institution, what support services are available, what new opportunities exist, and what strengths and shortcomings they themselves have (Chickering 1978; Zuspan 1978). Positive results were shown in students' grade-point averages, the use of resources, greater class attendance, and in attitudes toward the institution (Christensen 1964; Ducat and Lieberman 1978).

The common element of success in all of these programs has been the involvement of academic advisors, especially faculty, in all phases of the orientation program. The mutual cooperation of orientation and advising personnel in planning and the implementation of these programs has proven effective.

Residence Halls—As described previously, academic advising in residence halls has been used in peer and outreach delivery efforts, and two programs are noteworthy. Petersen and Lambert (1977) described residential advising programs involving peer advisors, faculty lunch programs in the dining halls, and special residential and instructional facilities for those with specific academic interests at the University of Vermont.

One of the oldest residential advising programs exists at Miami University of Ohio. Since 1929 live-in advisors have been available to assist in the integration of the academic, personal, and social lives of freshmen. Although originally staffed by faculty, the program now employs full-time, entry-level, professional staff who provide all types of general information to freshmen, especially those whose career plans are uncertain. The program is marked by continuous availability, direct advisor contact, and an institutional balance and perspective necessary for college freshmen. The program is coordinated with chief departmental advisors and faculty advisors (Hart, Deutsch, and Rogers 1978).

The use of residential facilities and staff is well worth considering in the expansion of academic advising services, especially as student affairs divisions are sought for assistance. Other campus student affairs offices also should be considered as academic advising efforts are studied. Offices of financial aid, student government, campus activities, and community service need to be made more aware of the reciprocal natural of their individual functions in relation to the advising process.

In any case, academic affairs and student affairs personnel need to seek each other's cooperation and support. Academic advising can serve as a kind of magnetic thread to mend the historical rift between these constituencies and to draw the best elements of each to provide students with a better college experience.

The Faculty

No matter what advising delivery system is used, and no matter how comprehensive the advising approach might be, the most significant guide in academic advising is still the curriculum. The faculty determines general education, major, and minor curriculum requirements, and thus the interfacing relationship between faculty and the advising process is paramount. Several new approaches in undergraduate curricula have demanded an even stronger advising relationship with faculty: a change in the overall structure of general education (prescribed versus open), challenge examinations for course credit, internships, student-assisted instruction, individually designed degrees and learning experiences, external degrees, as well as concerns for course standards, grading schemes, and academic dishonesty (Chickering 1973; Bevilacqua 1976). These developments require both faculty policymaking and more advisor awareness and communication.

The curricular area given much attention recently is the "credit-for-life-experience" option. Faculty contended that unmatched formal classroom requirements, competition with the regular curriculum, high administrative costs, inordinate time demands, and a weakening of academic standards mark the credibility of such an option (Bondeson 1977; Sawhill 1978). Proponents have argued that students who can demonstrate acquired skills and knowledge the same as those educated in classrooms are deserving of equal recognition, that such recognition maximizes the efficiency of instruction and motivation of the student, that this option is similar to a traditional grade assignment, and that accrediting agencies have not prohibited

the use of such credit (Meyer 1975; Woods 1977). The latter point is exemplified in the regional accreditation of Thomas Edison College of New Jersey and Empire State College in New York, degree-granting institutions chartered specifically to recognize nontraditional modes of learning. Additionally, Woods (1977, 1978) found that time usage is not as great as generally assumed, especially if a seminar or other standardized evaluation procedure is used, and that institutional costs are offset, since the institution provides assessment without instruction and since future course enrollments are almost certain to be generated by students who explore this option.

There is little question that the process of awarding credit for life experience demands a significant amount and quality of academic advisement. Not only do advisors need to be aware of this curricular option, but they must also facilitate the process. The advisor assists (usually older) students to develop confidence in the expression of their experiences, to translate those experiences into an academic format, and to prepare the documentation necessary to receive credit (Meyer 1975; Woods 1977; Sawhill 1978).

Another curriculum interface with the advising process has been through a new type of course offering, the Freshman Seminar. At a time in the college career when classes seem like high school, when the common instructional mode is lecture, and when courses seem disjointed, the seminar addresses transition problems from high school to college. It further attempts to relate various academic studies to individual life and career goals, to emphasize the intellectual life of the college, and to provide the student with a personal access to the institution—often the advisor (Robinson 1972; Fogarty 1978).

The success of such courses has been noted in retention rates, grade-point averages, and student attitudes, perceptions, and general satisfaction with the college environment (Robinson 1972; Hadley 1977, 1978). First semester students at Ricks College, whose advisor was also one of their current instructors, rated their advisement much more effective than those who did not experience this dual relationship (Crockett 1978). This finding supports Crookston's (1972) concept that advising is, in fact, teaching.

Since advising and teaching both involve an exchange of facts and feelings to provide direction and to change behavior, the two are natural adjuncts (Hallberg 1964; Hardee 1970; Crookston 1972). The assessment of learning styles exemplifies this dual relationship. Fuhrmann and Jacobs (1976) identified dependent, collaborative,

and independent learning styles and are developing the *Learning Style Inventory* to identify them. For the academic advisor this research suggests that knowledge of a student's preferred learning style will assist in the selection of courses, instructors, academic majors, and perhaps result in improved academic performance.

Faculty development programs also have potential for interfacing with academic advising. Faculty development is:

> an institutional process which seeks to modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting student needs, their own needs, and the needs of the institution. Successful programs change the way faculty feel about their professional roles, increase their knowledge and skills in those roles, and alter the way they carry them out in practice (Francis 1975, p. 20).

The advising process could be described very similarly.

Faculty development efforts grew in the 1970's due to less faculty mobility, various disenchantments with the quality of instruction, the attrition crisis, and more monies made available from funding agencies. Program content has included curriculum development, course design, diagnosis of teaching, the acquisition of interpersonal and career counseling skills, and organizational development and function (Centra 1976, 1978). Many of these programs, skills, and elements are similar to those required in a comprehensive academic advising program. Rather than increased faculty knowledge in their disciplines, reduced class sizes, the use of media and technology, and even their own evaluations, students preferred a more personalized, enlivened approach to learning, one that could be developed through good academic advising programs (Morstain and Gaff 1977).

Kramer (1978) linked advising to the larger faculty development effort because improvements in advising are less threatening than in teaching, and thus easier to achieve. He acknowledged that a faculty development program for improving advising competence is realistic only when advising is supported as an important function, when faculty are perceived as sound resource investments for the future, and when financial support is given. Unfortunately, Centra (1976) found minimal use of activities designed to improve academic advising and counseling skills, even when these programs were effective.

The interfacing of academic advising with the faculty domains of curriculum and professional development cannot be ignored. These relationships will continue and must be maximized to enhance both the curriculum and the professional functions of the faculty.

Students

The results of the interactive relationships described above ultimately impact on the primary asset of our institutions—the students. The academic advising process occurs regularly for students and might well be the significant factor in their academic success or failure, satisfaction or discontent, and their retention or attrition.

The two most comprehensive longitudinal research studies on the effects of the college experience reported that college students undergo changes in their attitudes, beliefs, and self-concepts in accordance with their own characteristics, major fields of study, and peer and faculty relationships. Faculty relationships are especially realized through the advising process (Feldman and Newcomb 1969; Astin 1978).

Although research is conflicting as to the relationship of various student demographic characteristics with advising satisfaction, the increasing diversity of students must be recognized and accommodated. Contemporary college students differ in their ages, socioeconomic levels, prior educational experiences, abilities, maturity, interests, aspirations, motivations, and values. Advisors, therefore, are challenged to comfort complacent students, to assist frustrated students, to redirect misguided students, to make students more self-aware, and to have students explore new learnings (Chickering 1973; Caldwell and Wesley 1977; Smith 1979). Certain portions of this diverse student population have been targeted for special advising assistance.

Nontraditional Students—A multitude of students has been classified under the rubric of "nontraditional," but the type most often identified as such is the 25-year-old-or-older college student. Most of these students are returning to college after interruptions due to raising families, military service, or fulltime employment; some are experiencing college for the first time; and many are attempting these challenges concurrently. These new challenges have provided our staid institutions with a new opportunity for renewal through the promotion of learning as a lifelong activity and by showing that they can adapt to the changing needs of a complex society (Meyer 1975). The role of the academic advisor in the academic life of these students can be critical, especially in a traditional campus setting.

Advisors need to be made aware of the special characteristics and needs of the older student population. Schlossberg (1978) argued that these adults behave according to social rather than biological norms, according to "stages" rather than "ages" of life, and differently ac-

cording to sex. Such behavior is evidenced in a lack of self-confidence, an unrealistic expectation for achievement, value conflicts with younger students, only short-term and immediate-use planning, poor study skills, or a failure to seek assistance. They continually experience transitions requiring adaptations, reassessments, and sometimes new identities and intimacies. The advisor, then, must be aware of adult development and behavior, capitalize on their backgrounds and experiences, refocus their learning goals and habits, and especially offer support to these special students in a special venture (Fisher 1977; Sawhill 1978; Hennessey 1979).

A variety of off-campus advising efforts has been designated specifically for nontraditional students. The Free Public Library of Philadelphia has established six Lifelong Learning Centers to provide information, counseling, and workshops; private agencies have funded such projects as the Women's Inner-City Education Resource Service, Inc. (WINNERS) for low-income and minority women in Boston; the National Center for Educational Brokering provides adult students with professional assistance to make appropriate educational choices; and Educational Improvement Centers have been authorized to provide comprehensive educational and career information and counseling services (Titterington 1978). The University Without Walls program at the University of Minnesota successfully uses program advisors, university faculty members, and community faculty for program planning and implementation, documenting prior learning, and developing community-based study projects (Marienau 1979).

Women Students—Although the "nontraditional" category is often equated with returning women, women students pose some unique advising concerns generally. The stereotypic myths and attitudes about the abilities and career expectations of women have prompted these concerns.

The foremost myth concerning women's academic abilities is that they innately lack mathematical and science proficiencies. However, sex differences in math achievement are not evident until grade 8 or 9; they are due to differential course selection rather than learning ability; and they are perpetuated by parents, teachers, and counselors. As a result college women tend to avoid majors requiring math proficiency and to drop out of math courses when they do enroll in them (Moller 1979).

With respect to career development, Astin (1977) found that women students earn higher grades than men, but fewer graduate or

pursue postgraduate study. He also inferred that both men and women may be perpetuating their own career stereotypes by leaving the fields traditionally occupied by the opposite sex.

Certain strategies and techniques for advising women students have been suggested. Advisors need to identify women role-models on the campus, to understand the internal and external forces on women's career development, to stimulate confidence in their intellectual aspirations and performance (especially in mathematics), and to encourage more academic risk-taking in women students (Lacher 1978; Newburg 1978; Moller 1979; O'Neil et al. 1979). Some techniques to facilitate these efforts have included a faculty and staff resource manual for women students (O'Neil et al. 1979), a group approach to decisionmaking (Sacks and Eisenstein 1979), and the use of behavioral self-management techniques to increase awareness of a woman's self- and environmental influences (Krumboltz and Shapiro 1979).

Minority Students—The identical stereotypic myths and attitudes about the abilities and career expectations of women exist for minority students, especially black students. They are often further complicated by financial difficulties, fewer role-models in faculty and staff, a dearth of social and cultural programs suited to their interests, and an overall unsupportive environment (Goodrich 1976). Nieves (1977) reported that minority students tend to feel unentitled to college, isolated, and alienated; they have unrealistic (high and low) goals and an intense fear of failure; they sense a limited control over their academic lives. They manifest these tendencies through withdrawal (apathy), separation (from whites), assimilation (into the environment), or by a strong affirmation of their self-worth and achievement motivation.

The advisor of minority students should promote a "welcoming" attitude, learn more about their backgrounds, abilities, and goals so as to avoid further academic demise, provide assistance in basic academic and self-help skills, help formulate an academic plan, encourage their participation in committees and activities, and even act "in loco parentis" (Nieves 1977; Clayton 1978). This is not to say, however, that minority students should receive preferential academic treatment in courses, grades, or expectations, nor should they assume the advisor has made certain assumptions about them (Winston 1976; Thomas 1978).

Clayton and Goodrich (1977) presented a comprehensive program for facilitating the successful advisement of minority students. This

"data-driven advisement model" is based on the gathering and delivery of data to key advising personnel who can use them to improve retention rates and the quality of advisement for minority students. The data are gathered by the Office of Minority Student Education and disseminated through a variety of workshops, a computerized academic monitoring system, and a Minority (peer) Advisement Program in each academic division. The program is further enhanced by an Academic Articulation Program, which uses divisional committees to monitor resources, to identify curriculum needs, and to review recruitment and retention data and advising services for minority students (Goodrich 1976).

Undecided or Exploratory Students—In many institutions those students who have not specified a major field of study are advised in an advisement center. Many individual advisors must also advise such students, especially where centers do not exist, and various strategies, techniques, and conditions have been proposed for such advising.

The primary reason for the attention given "undecided" students in recent years is that they tend to leave our institutions more than those students who have made even tentative choices. With the concern for retention, the need for more intensive advising of the largest constituency of exit-prone students is obvious. By providing these students with better decisionmaking skills and clearer educational and career options, they become better informed and better able to plan an educational path. The academic advisor is the best provider of such information.

Students are undecided in varying degrees. Some students are completely undecided and have absolutely no academic plans or career goals; some are tentatively undecided and are considering several choices; still others are committed but are not personally ready or are not permitted by their institution to formalize their choices. Whatever the degree of indecision, however, advisors must be able to understand the student's condition. They must resist vested interests in single disciplines and become generalists in knowledge of academic programs; they must understand career development and relate it to academic and career choices.

The label of "undecided" should be considered positive and healthy, especially since students so often change their majors, career plans, and actual jobs. Gelso and Sims (1968) found that 21 percent of the students who had indicated specific majors on their application for admission changed their minds before they registered

for the first time. Pressure from parents, peers, and sometimes advisors to declare a major is, therefore, unwarranted and undesirable. For the most part these students are no different from others in academic abilities, emotional maturity, or social sophistication; their only distinguishing characteristic is that they are undecided about a specific academic major at that time.

A variety of techniques, materials, and integrated programs exists to assist these students in making wise educational choices. These include credit-bearing courses, special orientation sessions, noncredit seminars, self-instructional packages, checklists and inventories of interests, strengths and attitudes, career libraries, handbooks and survival kits, directories of resources, and curriculum guides. Several examples of these and integrated approaches to the advisement of undecided students are described by Crockett (1978, 1979).

A brief mention needs also to be made of the potential difficulties in advising the "decided" student. Those who have made a firm choice about a major, career, and perhaps even a specific job may be more difficult to advise than those who have not. Analogous to building a pyramid, advising an undecided student requires building a broad base and working up to a pinnacle, but the structure is reversed with the decided student (Grites 1978). The advisor might play a "devil's advocate" role with decided students. This role would challenge students to question the expectations of others and to look beyond the prescribed major curriculum; the advisor should only be satisfied when the student has reached a decision through an examination of alternatives (Smith 1979).

Between these extremes lies a continuum of decisions. One type of student has declared a major, but has little or no idea what specific career or job to pursue upon completion of that major; another student has chosen the wrong major, but may have too much time, effort, and money invested in that choice to pursue anything else. In all cases a strong alternative career-planning strategy and adequate sources of referral are necessary for effective academic advisement.

Others—A myriad of additional special categories of students exists, and individual campuses and advising programs must also accommodate their unique needs. For example, transfer students face limited financial aid, loss of credit, inadequate orientation, diverse grading systems and criteria, and possibly inaccurate advisement prior to arrival. Many of these problems can be minimized, especially for two-year college students who transfer to four-year institutions, through clear articulation agreements and precollege advisement programs.

Foreign students present unique problems, and their advisors are often both an academic focal point and the student's closest identification point with the institution, or indeed this country. These advisors must be aware of language difficulties, inadequate preparation in certain academic subjects, study skills deficiencies, as well as currency, visa, housing, and dietary concerns.

Preprofessional students probably require specialized advisors. Not only are these students very decided about their majors and careers, but they are also in a highly competitive market. The preprofessional advisor must be especially adept at recognizing potential failures and still be able to convince these students they have much to contribute and to gain in alternative careers. In addition preprofessional advisors must maintain accurate information regarding admission to various law, social work, medical, dental, veterinary, and other health-related professional schools, as well as communicate the quality of their own programs and applicants to those schools.

Other high-ability students are those often overlooked in the advising process. Students who excel in classes and make their own decisions are often left to their own advising; it is assumed they will meet established requirements, find other resources when needed, and proceed through the system unscathed; however, advisors are doing these students an injustice if they do not provide them the same time, opportunities, challenges, and assistance as other students.

Veterans and handicapped students are still others who have special advising concerns. Some designated campus official usually has specific responsibilities for advocating the needs and facilitating the processes affecting these students, but the academic advisor is often consulted to coordinate academic planning, to interpret academic policies, and to confirm their academic choices.

To this point the role and responsibility of the advisor alone has been emphasized. Advising, however, is a dual relationship, and the responsibilities are shared. The responsibility of the student in the advising relationship must be emphasized.

Most college catalogs contain some statement like "the student is responsible for meeting all requirements for graduation." And most advisors, deans, counselors, and registrars would affirm this statement. However, institutional representatives do make errors in awarding credits, in interpreting policies, or in designating specific course requirements. Who becomes responsible? Does the student graduate without meeting the standards? Is action taken to prevent such errors in the future? There is a fine line between student and institutional

responsibility, and the advisor is often the judge of this responsibility.

Faculty advisors may have many advisees, as well as other responsibilities, and cannot realistically be expected to know every intricate policy, procedure, rule, and regulation in fine detail. The advisee, therefore, must make an effort to read and understand the catalog, to question interpretations, and to verify them with other sources. For the student to accept the advisor's advice blindly is to abdicate responsibility. For the advisor to determine every answer for the student is to inhibit growth. The advisor must respect the student's rights of responsibility, self-determination, and even failure; the student must accept them.

Some of the specific behaviors by which students demonstrate their responsibility include making appointments at other than peak advising periods, keeping scheduled appointments, coming to the appointment prepared with information that has already been considered, keeping their own records, meeting deadlines, providing complete and accurate information about themselves, their choices, and their plans or ideas, and offering to determine answers, obtain forms, or provide additional information between appointments. If students learn nothing else from their college experience, at least they should leave the institution with a sense of responsibility for their actions and the consequences resulting from those actions. The advising relationship fosters that sense, and emphasis on its *shared* responsibility cannot be overstated.

An Integrated Effort

This chapter has focused on the interrelationships between the academic advising process and many other campus agencies, processes, and constituencies. The advisor, whether intentionally or not, becomes the chief liaison, consultant, and interpreter for both students and the institution. Whether the advisor is relating to faculty, counselors, the registrar, deans, committees, students, or other advisors, the institutional programs, policies, and resources must be interfaced with student needs, concerns, and desires for the process to be effective. The advising process becomes one of total institutional integration, and its outcomes are shared by all the participants.

With such integration institutions foster a "developmental milieu" in which all elements of the institution serve common goals. These goals include the development of a realistic, compatible relationship between the campus experience and the outside world, the develop-

ment of student responsibility, independence, values, and lifestyles, and the development of learning techniques, occupational futures, and interpersonal relations (Brown 1972; Katz 1973; Miller and Prince 1976). The advisement process links the total campus community in an effort to provide the best possible college experience at the least possible expense to that community. To achieve this, academic advising will have to become much more effective and wide-ranging, requiring more knowledgeable and sensitive advisors and more staff (New Jersey 1979, p. 21).

Summary and Implications

The previous chapters provided the historical development of academic advising, the methods employed to provide this service, and the interrelationship of this process with other campus constituencies. Academic advising in higher education has evolved from the very simplistic beginnings of routine, perfunctory course scheduling to a complex process of student development requiring comprehensive knowledge and skills. From the literature presented several conclusions can be drawn.

First, *academic advising cannot be done in isolation.* The successful advising program or individual relationship does not occur in the limited confines of the advisor's office. Without the awareness and use of other campus personnel, services, and resources both the advisor and advisee are limited in their growth and effectiveness. To use one's own personal skills and resources, other resource centers and advisors, and students themselves is to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the advising process. Success in this area requires a concerted effort that has been carefully and systematically planned. It will not happen simply because the components of a system appear to be present in a given environment (Mash 1978, p. 36).

Second, *there is no single formula for successful academic advising.* Each institution must decide on its own appropriate delivery system(s) and the extent to which other campus resources can be integrated into the advising process. Each advisor must decide which techniques, skills, and other resources will be used most effectively with each student. Furthermore, when a successful approach is determined, continued inquiry, adaptations, and enhancements of that approach need to be explored; the advising process can never afford to become stagnant.

Third, *the role of academic advising in the future of higher education will become more prominent.* Facing projected enrollment declines, institutions have concentrated on the retention of the students they enroll. The advising process has proven effective in that effort, i.e., more effective advising yields higher retention rates. The future indicates even more reasons to concentrate on academic advising as a retention process. The investment in a college education continues to result in higher lifetime earnings and more productive members of society; therefore, economic and social benefits accrue

from the retention of college students. By 1995 much of our professional and technical work forces, currently made up of those students who swelled our institutions in the 1950's, will be leaving. Coupled with a declining birthrate and an increasing demand in rapidly expanding fields like health and computer sciences, a supply crisis will exist. Institutions must plan now to balance the future supply-demand ratio for college graduates (New Jersey 1979). The advising process, beginning with recruitment and proven effective in retention, is that which can accommodate the future needs of our students, our institutions, and our society.

Institutions must realize not only the potential and benefits of a sound academic advising program but also the implications of achieving this. The first implication to be considered is that a clear understanding of the advising process is necessary to achieve effectiveness. What *is* the process? What *should* it be? What *commitment* is being made to reach that end? These are not easy quesions to answer, but they are essential if a clear understanding is expected.

Basic to its understanding is a published institutional statement regarding the advising process. Whether it be called a definition, policy, or philosophy, some readily available, well-articulated statement must be communicated to all those potentially involved in the process. The absence of such a statement breeds confusion and allows for assumptions, both of which break down an operable system. Examples of advising statements are found in DeLisle (1965), Hardee (1970), and Crockett (1978, 1979).

The next step in attempting to understand the total process is to analyze or formulate specific objectives developed from the institutional statement. These might be general or specific and are usually outcome-oriented, but they must be articulated. Each institution must develop such objectives in accordance with its statement about advising.

The final step in understanding the advising process is to realize the institutional commitment to its published statement and objectives. Without continued, strong, campus-wide support the advising program is subject to criticism, ineffectiveness, and probable failure. Daniels and Kiernan (1965) concluded that the success of their faculty advising program was largely due to the publicized overt support of the administration (p. 33). Not only the administration, however, needs to be supportive. Perhaps as with retention, whoever is not working *for* a successful advising program is working against it. Therefore, all campus constituencies need to be assessed

for their support of this process; this includes students, faculty, and all administrative personnel. A realization of the commitment, whether it be minimal or maximal, assumed or explicit, psychological or financial, must be clearly understood before certain efforts can be actualized; this leads to a second implication.

This actualization must respond to the continuous, changing conditions in higher education and will always be dependent upon the superlative management of fiscal, physical, and human resources. Reallocation of budget priorities, new space provisions, and/or revised job descriptions may be necessary to achieve the objectives of the advising program. Such changes will not come easily, and they will need to be justified to the extreme; when made, however, and managed effectively, the whole institution will benefit.

Appleton, Moore, and Vinton (1978) concluded that proper management would foster the coordination of efforts and resources and general policy and programming between academic and student affairs units, as well as provide for the optimal use of central resources. Informal arrangements across lines of authority might be even more productive than formal organizational structures in achieving this coordination.

Thus the expert management of institutional resources is essential to the provision of effective academic advising, an activity that requires substantial interfacing with the entire institutional community. There is no question that some institutions will need to divert more resources to the advising effort. Some of the specific concerns when considering new resource management strategies provide further implications for achieving an effective advising program.

A summative implication of new resource management strategies is simply that certain risks will need to be taken. Administrators will no longer be able to manage their resources by merely filling personnel lines, inflating budgetary requests, and redesigning space allocations. A complete analysis of the available resources, their allocation, and the acquisition of new sources of support will be required. As the advising program is affected, certain adjustments will be necessitated, sometimes with risk.

The areas in which such adjustments are most likely to be requested are the hiring, salary, promotion, and tenure of faculty advisors. As prospective faculty are interviewed, they need to be made aware of all faculty duties, including teaching, research and publication, advising, committee work, administrative detail, and the relative importance placed on each of these tasks.

This information has two further implications related to the hiring process. First, position descriptions and faculty contracts may need to be rewritten to reflect accurate faculty workloads. For example, Teague and Grites (in press) found that 50 percent of the faculty contracts they reviewed made absolutely no mention of academic advising as a required faculty duty. Another 25 percent merely listed advising as a responsibility, but with no further specification. Without specification the advising responsibility could legally be refused by faculty.

Second, graduate and professional programs that will produce our future college faculties need to provide graduate students with both information and experience in all faculty roles. Many of these students enter their first faculty positions with excellent research and writing skills, but with minimal professional teaching skills, and virtually no skills in advising. Yet these new, inexperienced faculty often must teach large classes of inexperienced (freshman) students and assume a substantial advising load. Such unrealistic expectations benefit neither the student nor the new faculty member.

There is little question that credit for effective advising must be included in the institutional reward structure, i.e., in salary increments, promotions in rank, and tenure decisions. The absence of a policy that equates excellence in advising with excellence in teaching and research serves as a major deterrent to faculty commitment and accounts for the attitude of many faculty toward it (DeLisle 1965). Borgard, Hornbuckle, and Mahoney (1977) found that faculty do not perceive advising as important for professional advancement and concluded that the relative merit of advising must be defined within the teaching, research, and service criteria for faculty advancement. Academic advising needs to be advocated as a part of the faculty reward structure.

The common consideration throughout these efforts is the provision of adequate *time* for advising. This might be done through reductions in teaching loads, committee assignments, administrative duties, or through new task assignments. For example, Katz (1973) suggested that a member of each academic department be charged with procuring and providing information about the potential occupational futures of its students.

More time for advising might also be provided through the development of better advising communications systems and alternative advising delivery systems. When advisors have ready access to clearly articulated information, time savings are realized. Such information

appears in brochures, catalogs, curriculum guides, handbooks, and computer printouts, and some personnel and fiscal resources may need to be diverted toward their improvement. In addition, the creation of advisement centers or peer/paraprofessional advising programs might be considered to provide more effective use of time in the program.

A final consideration in the facilitation of time effectiveness for advisors is the amount of general comfort provided. Secretarial or student assistance in typing, filing, and scheduling, adequate office space and furnishings, direct phone lines, and general overall assistance are all-important, time-saving devices that can result in better advising.

None of the above effects can be achieved without a certain amount of risk-taking in resource management. Where resources are scant, institutions might request assistance from various funding agencies so they at least are able to attempt some of the programs discussed. If proven successful, necessary funding for the future will be supported, perhaps both internally and externally.

Recommendations

With the information above, institutions should be able to develop their advising programs to insure maximum effectiveness. While each institution will determine the specific mechanisms to achieve this effectiveness, certain recommendations seem generally appropriate.

Recommendation 1: Conduct a thorough assessment study—Before an advising program can hope to improve, its current efforts and efficiencies must be clearly understood. This recommendation suggests a self-study approach to assess the program's overall utility, relevance, and effectiveness.

The areas to be investigated in this process include the definition or statement of philosophy about the advising program, the stated objectives or expected outcomes of the program, the delivery system(s) employed, the allocation of resources to the program, the formal organizational lines of authority and accountability for the program, the rewards of the program, the informal relationships necessary to support the program, and the general attitudes toward the program. In short, what is the level of commitment? These assessments are made by reviewing existing publications (catalogs, contracts, budget ledgers, and job descriptions), by soliciting faculty, staff, and student perceptions (surveys and interviews), and by developing illustrative materials (flowcharts and impact diagrams).

A variety of data should also be reviewed, such as the numbers of advisor appointments, registration errors, changes of major, class withdrawals, and referrals, as well as advisor loads, retention rates, course registrations, grade-point averages, and graduate school and job-placement ratios. Much of this information should be readily available from the computer center, registrar, or institutional studies offices.

In conducting such a study some surprising results might be obtained. Carstensen (1979), for example, found that 71 percent of the institutions in his national study had no published statement of philosophy, goals, objectives, etc. Duncan (1973) found not only that most programs did not have written advising objectives, but also that they had no procedure for students to choose or change advisors and that the off-campus State Employment Office was a principal referral source. Other findings might include unrealistic job descriptions for

advisors, greatly imbalanced advisor loads, inordinate amounts of fiscal resources used for relatively unproductive activities or services, duplications of services or programs, inaccurate assumptions about students, or perhaps none of these.

Most self-study approaches require that both objective and subjective data be reviewed by a group of institutional representatives, i.e., a task force or committee. Individual representatives might concentrate on specific areas to be studied, perhaps recruit new advocates in the process, determine a course of action, and ultimately actualize the plan.

Astin (1976) reported a variety of changes in advising programs at several of the 19 institutions in a data-based intervention project using a committee structure. He argued that such committees need administrative and faculty support, a designated amount of resources, and continuance beyond the final report to the implementation stage; they need to consider the institutional conservatism or resistance to change, the maximum use of resources, appropriate evaluation schemes based on specific outcome criteria, and the design of the evaluation research. They must also be cautious not to succumb to certain intellectual "games" that are sometimes used to avoid what the data actually indicate; that is, the subjective analysis of the data must not excuse findings that may be unflattering or negative.

Also, Bess (1979) described a complete "management information system," using a variety of student data for improved academic instruction and management; Kramer and Gardner (1978) applied a similar approach specifically to the advising process.

A thorough analysis of the advising program, complete with various kinds and sources of data, marks the beginning of an improved advising program. Without analysis a fragmented, imbalanced, undirected program will likely occur.

Recommendation 2: Identify one person whose primary responsibility is to coordinate the advising program—Just as faculty members set priorities for their various responsibilities, so do those responsible for advising programs. Unless advising is designated as *the* priority responsibility of an individual, it will probably be reduced to a position of lesser importance. When in competition with other academic administrative duties, like planning course offerings, assessing workloads, writing reports, recruiting new faculty, preparing budgets, proposing grants, hearing grievances, and evaluating faculty, advising is easily forgotten. With someone to coordinate the advis-

ing effort from a total perspective, i.e., in terms of appropriate delivery and communication systems, data collection, and interfacing relationships, the program is continually monitored rather than only at specified times or when crises occur.

Carstensen (1979), however, found that only 17 percent of the institutions reported a director or coordinator of advising position; most identified deans, vice presidents, or department chairpersons as having this responsibility. He further found that only 39 percent of these directors were used full time for advising and that 60 percent had less than seven years' experience in advising. These results indicate the relative lack of specification and expertise in advising programs.

Other position titles and descriptions have been suggested that would serve the same basic functions as the advisement coordinator. These include a dean or assistant as coordinator and chair of a commission on advising and counseling (Hale 1978), a student development consultant (Miller and Prince 1976), a dean of freshmen (Zuspan 1978), and an administrative intervenor (Kramer 1978; Mash forthcoming).

Whatever the title or description, two implications are evident. First, the coordinator must have a broad range of credibility, i.e., the interest, respect, and appreciation of faculty, of both academic and student affairs administrators, and of students. Second, having a designated coordinator suggests the "advisement center" concept, i.e., one location where all advising problems are referred and where new programs are developed. For some institutions this will mean a number of central offices in various schools and colleges; for others it will mean a campuswide office. In all institutions it will mean a more effective advising program.

Recommendation 3: Implement an advisor selection process—There is no question that some persons are better advisors than others. Some advisors simply do not want to advise, but are required to do so; some advisors may want to advise, but simply are ineffective in this role. Whatever percentage of advisors in a system are not there by their own choice or are ineffective approximates the percentage of failure the system must expect to endure. As institutions find it necessary to be more responsive to the needs of students, such failures must be avoided.

Faculty advising programs are especially vulnerable to this weakness. Whereas staff advisors, counselors, and even peer advisors are carefully screened for advisement positions, faculty advisors are often

merely given this responsibility without further consideration. These same faculty would never be hired, promoted, tenured, or granted a sabbatical on such limited criteria, yet they are assumed to be capable advisors.

Carstensen (1979) found that 39 percent of the institutions using primarily faculty advisors indicated that *all* faculty have some responsibility for advising; yet about half of these same institutions reported some type of selective assignment process; therefore, selection is possible even when all faculty must advise. For example, better advisors might be selected to advise new students, probationary students, or undecided students; those less interested or less effective might advise only junior and senior majors, who typically are more knowledgeable, resourceful, and self-sufficient. Another variation might be to rotate the advising loads by not using first-year faculty or faculty in their year of tenure preparation.

The criteria most often mentioned for advisor selection include knowledge and understanding of the institution, interest in and understanding of students, good interpersonal skills, the ability to use information, availability, and a willingness to improve (Hale 1974; Caldwell and Wesley 1977; Crockett 1978). Koile (1955) developed an instrument for measuring interest in advising and found that women and middle-aged faculty were more interested in this function. Bess (1973) surmised that older faculty tend to be less open to new ideas students are seeking, and that younger faculty are seeking recognition and competency in their research and teaching.

Selectivity of faculty advisors has resulted in better student satisfaction, better faculty perceptions of advising, and improved retention rates (Alberti 1972; Glennen 1976; Mahoney, Borgard, and Hornbuckle 1978; Myers, et al. 1979). Regardless of the specific criteria, the important step is to employ some selection process for advisors.

Recommendation 4: Develop an advisor training (development) program—If the advising program is to meet its objectives effectively, then each advisor must have the appropriate knowledge and skills. Professional staff advisors, counselors, and peer advisors are normally hired because they already possess many of these skills or are subject to learning them as a condition of employment. Faculty advisors, however, have rarely been provided such training and are usually the focus of advisor training programs. For this reason, "developmental programs" may be a more acceptable term when directed toward faculty advisor improvement.

Centra (1976) found that those most apt to participate in faculty development programs were those who were already competent and wanted to get better. He hastened to add that by having the proficient faculty in attendance reduces the reputation that such programs are only for the deficient, and there is probably no better way to drive faculty away from a program than to identify it as a service for the inadequate (p. 59). Therefore, simple terminology could affect the success of such programs.

Faculty advisor development programs have improved advisor satisfaction, the advisor-advisee relationship, retention rates, various academic variables, and even classroom teaching (Glennen 1971; Gelwick 1974; Kaufmann and Netusil 1975). However, Carstensen (1979) found that 17 percent of the institutions with faculty advisor programs had *no* training, and only 24 percent reported any regular on-campus training. Most reported using only written communication and/or a single orientation meeting.

The more comprehensive programs have included a wide range of information and skills development. The informational advising areas include institutional structure and function, academic policies, procedures, and programs, and an introduction to various service and referral agencies. Most of the skills developed have been in interpersonal relationships, such as listening, attending behaviors, self-disclosure, referring, recognizing possible psychological problems, questioning, decisionmaking, and confrontation (Crockett 1978, 1979).

Though faculty may at first be uncomfortable and resist learning interpersonal (counseling) skills, results indicate a need for such, especially in freshman advising. Freshmen have come to campus unprepared for the social and psychological transitions facing them and tend to avoid seeking counseling assistance (Gelso and Thompson 1970; Grites in press). The academic advisor is often the only official contact for these students and, therefore, must be adequately prepared to offer such assistance if needed.

Advisor training programs have been described in various formats. Jones (1963) suggested an institute approach conducted in four 90-minute sessions over a two-week period; Bonar (1976) developed a complete systems approach; Grites (1978) suggested a modular approach in six content areas. The specific techniques used in any of these formats could include formal presentations with discussions, experiential activities, self-paced manuals, role playing, case studies, guest consultants, films, handbooks, checklists, and various sources of

data. Examples of many of these techniques are found in Crockett (1978, 1979).

It is normally assumed that faculty advisor training programs must occur on a collective basis; however, there are other means of developing faculty expertise in advising. Each time a phone inquiry is made from an advisor, and information is provided, a kind of training effort has occurred; well-developed advising handbooks, checklists, and other written information contribute to this effort. Appropriate journal articles might be summarized and circulated to advisors to stimulate ideas; an Advising Resource Center should be established, which includes appropriate institutional documents as well as other major sources of information. These might include Crockett (1978, 1979) for a wealth of practical examples, Astin (1976, 1977) for ideas on the uses of data, the Proceedings from the National Conferences on Academic Advising for additional examples, and this report for its current analysis and bibliography.

Whatever the format and techniques used, it is essential that some professional development efforts occur to meet the established objectives of the advising program. Even if basic informational and course advising is the only objective of the program, a good training effort will help realize that objective.

Recommendation 5: Develop an evaluation scheme—Obviously, if an advising program is to be effective, some type of evaluation must occur. A complete evaluation of the complex advising process should be both summative and formative, i.e., as a review and to develop new approaches, should include a variety of evaluators, and should be designed as a total scheme rather than as an incidental activity. Doyle's (1973) faculty evaluation model, which takes into consideration the purposes of evaluation, the focus and consequences of it, the sources of measurable data, their quality, the media for gathering the data, the time of collection, and the institutional goals, is appropriate to such a scheme.

An evaluation scheme for academic advising should begin with an advisor evaluation of the collective or centralized functions of the program, such as program objectives and adequacy of information provided. Before administrators of advising programs can rightfully evaluate individual advisors, they must be assured that their own responsibilities are being met.

Secondly, a student evaluation of the overall program should occur, but *not* in the typical questionnaire-at-preregistration mode, which is vulnerable to many confounding effects. It is difficult to know whether the results are attributable to the advising program,

the registration process, or a single recent advisor encounter. A better procedure would be to sample the student population via questionnaire in the middle of the term and follow-up a portion of the respondents with an interview to determine the response accuracy and validity.

The final phase of this scheme would be an individual advisor evaluation from self, student, and staff perspectives. Some of the criteria suggested for this phase include length and frequency of advising contacts, the nature of the topics discussed, the numbers of referrals and registration errors made, and general student satisfaction.

Crockett (1978, 1979) provided sample questionnaires for determining student satisfaction with the advising program and individual advisors. The Advisory Survey Form is another instrument and has been piloted at nine institutions. This rating scale was designed to identify advisor behaviors that relate differentially to advisee course selection, career exploration, and personal problemsolving. The early findings indicated such identification was possible, and further research on the instrument was encouraged (Brock 1978).

The actual use of evaluation practices is somewhat contradictory. Seldin (1975) found a 22 percent increase in the value of student advising in evaluating overall faculty performance, and Carstensen (1979) found that 30 percent of the institutions considered advising activities in promotion and tenure decisions; however, 80 percent of these institutions had no formal evaluation process. Conversely, Pino (1975) found that 80 percent of the advisement centers, using more staff and peer advisors, reported some type of evaluation procedure; almost two-thirds of the peer advising programs in Carstensen's (1979) study used formal evaluation procedures. These results indicate that advising may be considered in faculty performance, but little systematic evaluation exists.

If the advising program is to be effective, then evaluation is necessary; if evaluation is to be a constructive process, then all advisors must be evaluated. The disparity between evaluation of peer and faculty advisors only reinforces an attitude of unimportance toward faculty advising. If faculty advisors are not evaluated, then they cannot be expected to know and deal with their weaknesses, nor can advising be appropriately considered in the faculty reward structure.

Recommendation 6: Implement an incentive or reward system—No matter how much study, selection, training, or evaluation is

achieved in an advising program, there must be some incentive for advisors to perform this function well. Staff and peer advisors are normally paid, but most faculty advisors receive little compensation or reward for performing this function. Carstensen (1979) reported that 57 percent of the institutions provided *no* recognition for faculty advising. Without incentives faculty advising will devolve to its earlier status as perfunctory, unimportant, and burdensome.

The most obvious ways in which good faculty advising can be recognized are through released time from teaching, committee and/or administrative assignments, additional financial compensation, and consideration in salary, promotion, and tenure decisions. Such approaches have resulted in increased advisor contacts, more student satisfaction with advising, and higher retention rates (Siewert 1975; Glennen 1976; Myers et al. 1979).

These approaches may be too costly for some institutions, so other types of incentives have been used. Although there is a limit to its incentivesness, the intrinsic personal reward of helping students cannot be denied. In addition, recognition for good advising has been shown through appreciation lunches, advisor awards and certificates, opportunities for paid in-service workshops and summer employment, credit for independent-study teaching, letters of commendation, and general publicity to students, parents, other faculty, and the president. Miller (1972) suggested a weighted performance profile of nine professional faculty activities, including advising. Whatever the weight afforded the advising function or whatever the specific incentives provided, it is important that good advising be recognized as a part of overall faculty performance. In this way advising becomes a legitimate, desirable faculty activity and will be performed accordingly.

Recommendation 7: Review the total program every five years—Although certain revisions in the program will occur as needed, the institution should plan a complete systematic review on a regular basis, using the methodology established through the initial assessment study. In some cases only data changes will need to be analyzed; in others new objectives, delivery systems, resource allocations, or advisor selection, training, evaluation, and reward efforts may need to be developed. In all cases, new findings and approaches will be directed toward the improvement of the overall program, and these improvements will maintain advisement quality for the next cycle.

Recommendation 8: Conduct more research—In accomplishing the above recommendations, institutions should seek new ways to improve the academic advising process. As new programs are attemp-

ted or old ones tested, research studies should be designed to determine their relative worth and adaptability, and these results should be reported in professional journals. A good program at one institution might be the ultimate solution at another. Research and practice are tied together in a cyclical process, i.e., research leads to modified practices, which become the object of further research (Katz 1973). Advising is an academic process that lends itself to such a cycle, but has not yet been used to its fullest potential.

Conducting such research is no easy matter, however. Much of the research cited in this report has been of a survey type. Survey research should continue and even increase, but more experimental studies should also be undertaken. Gibson (1973) pointed out the difficulties of generating researchable hypotheses, or specifying conceptual variables, and of developing appropriate measuring instruments in conducting research on advising. These difficulties are due to the complexity of the process and have resulted in outcome-oriented, less generalizable results. He concluded that the gap between theory and actual advising requires the formulation of policies and programs based on studies of sound research (p. 7) and that the multidimensional nature of academic advising usually suggests a multivariate factor-analysis design.

Despite these difficulties, it is incumbent on those responsible for academic advising programs to conduct more research on their efforts. In this way successful advising programs will flourish with less struggle, and fewer wheels will be reinvented.

In summary, this report has attempted to provide both some old and some new views of the academic advising process in higher education. Carstensen (1979) reported the greatest overall need of advising programs was the identification of an advising model that provides both understanding and administration of the program; this report has hopefully begun to fill this need.

The literature and research reported here includes ideas and concerns that have been expressed for years, but now the critical element is implementation. The suggestions made are both necessary and possible, and they are possible with current resources. With some creative thinking to develop new strategies for institutional commitment and improvements, and with some risks taken to implement these strategies, the advising process will assume a leadership role in selecting and retaining students, in developing faculty, and in maximizing the use of all institutional resources—in other words, in getting us through the 1980's.

Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education (RIE)*. Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Ordering number and price for publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS have been included at the end of each citation. Readers who wish to order a publication should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Unless otherwise noted, documents are available in both microfiche (MF) and papercopy (PC).

Aitken, Carolyn E. and Conrad, Clifton F. "Improving Academic Advising through Computerization." *College and University* 53 (Fall 1977): 115-123.

Alberti, Robert E. "Influence of the Faculty on College Student Development." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13 (January 1972): 18-23.

Algier, Ann S. "A New Approach to Academic Rehabilitation." *Educational Record* 53 (1972): 80-84.

Appleton, James R.; Moore, Paul L.; and Vinton, John C. "A Model for the Effective Delivery of Student Services in Academic Schools and Departments." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (July/August 1978): 372-381.

Arnette, Johnny L. "Cooperative Education and Placement as an Integral Part of Academic and Career Advisement." *College and University* 50 (1974): 85-88.

Astin, Alexander W. *Preventing Students from Dropping Out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

———. *Academic Gamesmanship: Student-Oriented Change in Higher Education*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

———. *Four Critical Years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Baldwin, Roland A. "Student-to-Student Counseling: Final Report." 1975. ED 116 111. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.46.

Barlow, Sally H. and Wright, Dee. "Academic Contracting: Making Students Accountable." Paper presented at the National ACT-

AACRAO Seminar on Student Admission and Retention, 1976. Mimeographed.

Baumgardner, Steven R. and Rappoport, Leon. "Conflicts in Career Thinking: Analytic Advisors and Intuitive Students." El Paso: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Psychological Association, 1974. ED 105 317. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.96.

Baxter, Richard P. "A Study of the Emergence and Functioning of Academic Advising Centers Within Academic Units of Major Universities." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 32 (1971): 731A.

Berdie, Ralph F. "Counseling and Liberal Education." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 16 (January 1975): 3-9.

Bess, James L. "Integrating Faculty and Student Life Cycles." *Review of Educational Research* 43 (Fall 1973): 377-403.

———. "Classroom and Management Decisions Using Student Data: Designing an Information System." *Journal of Higher Education* 50 (May/June 1979): 256-279.

Betz, Ellen L.; Starr, Ann M.; and Menne, John W. "College Student Status in Ten Public and Private Colleges and Universities." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13 (September 1972): 456-461.

Bevilacqua, Joseph P. "The Changing Relationship Between the University and the Student: Implications for Student Personnel Work." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 17 (November 1976): 489-494.

Biggs, Donald A.; Brodie, J. S.; and Barnhart, W. J. "The Dynamics of Undergraduate Academic Advising." *Research in Higher Education* 3 (December 1975): 345-357.

Bonar, John R. "Developing and Implementing a Systems-Design Training Program for Academic Advisors." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 17 (May 1976): 190-198.

——— and Mahler, Linda R. "A Center for Undecided College Students." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 54 (May 1974): 481-484.

Bondeson, William. "Open Learning: Curricula, Courses, and Credibility." *Journal of Higher Education* 48 (January/February 1977): 96-103.

Borgard, John R.; Hornbuckle, Phyllis A.; and Mahoney, John. "Faculty Perceptions of Academic Advising." *NASPA Journal* 14 (Winter 1977): 4-10.

Borland, David T. "Curricular Planning through Creative Academic Advising." *NASPA Journal* 10 (January 1973): 211-217.

——— and Birmingham, Joseph C. "Academic Advising in the Community College: Mutual Irresponsibility?" *Texas Personnel and Guidance Association Journal* 5 (Fall 1977): 110-116.

Brock, Stephen C. "Measuring Faculty Advisor Effectiveness." Memphis: Paper presented at the Second National Conference on Academic Advising, 1978. Mimeographed.

Brown, Coke R. and Myers, Rosemary. "Student vs. Faculty Curriculum Advising." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 16 (May 1975): 226-231.

Brown, Patricia S. "A Discriminant Analysis of ACT Profile Data Differentiating Enrollees and Nonenrollees." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 20 (May 1979): 209-216.

Brown, Robert D. *Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy.* Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1972. ED 067 975. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.96.

Brown, William F. *Student to Student Counseling.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.

Burns, Kathryn N. and Kishler, Thomas C. *Centralized Academic Advising at Michigan State University.* East Lansing: University College Student Affairs Office, 1972.

Caldwell, James F. and Wesley, Dan. "Academic Advising in Higher Education." Springfield, Mo.: Paper presented at a regional meeting of Academic Affairs Administrators, 1977. Mimeographed.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Fair Practices in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Carstensen, Donald J. *A National Survey of Academic Advising.* Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Casey, Duane J. "Faculty Advising." In *Community College Student Personnel Work,* edited by L. S. MacLean and R. O. Washington, 1968. ED 025 265. MF-$0.98; PC-$21.51.

Centra, John A. *Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976. ED 141 382. MF-$0.98; HC-$7.46.

———. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (March/April 1978): 151-162.

———. "Reading the Enrollment Barometer." *Change* 11 (April 1979): 50-51+.

Chickering, Arthur W. "College Advising for the 1970's." In *Services for Students,* edited by Joseph Katz. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Christensen, Oscar C., Jr. "A Study of the Influence of an Early Orientation, Advising, and Counseling Program for Selected Freshmen Entering the University of Oregon." *Dissertation Abstracts* 24 (1964): 3164.

Chronicle of Higher Education 42 (November 13, 1978): 13.

———. 42 (January 22, 1979): 14-15.

Clayton, Robert. "Advising Minority Students." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document,* edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

——— and Goodrich, Andrew. "Advising Minority Students." In *National Conference on Academic Advising: A Publication of Proceedings,* edited by Gina Rayfield, Alton D. Roberts and Toni Trombley. Burlington: University of Vermont, 1977.

College Placement Council. *Four-Year Liberal Arts Graduates.* Bethlehem, Pa., 1975.

Conyne, Robert K. and Cochran, Donald J. "Academic and Career Development: Toward Integration." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 52 (December 1973): 217-223.

Cope, Robert G. and Hannah, William. *Revolving College Doors: The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out, Stopping Out, and Transferring.* New York: Wiley, 1975.

Coyle, T. Harrison. "Students Expect Teachers To Do More Than Teach." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 12 (January 1971): 58-61.

Crockett, David S., ed. *Academic Advising: A Resource Document.* Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

———. *Academic Advising: A Resource Document (1979 Supplement).* Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Crookston, Burns B. "A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13 (January 1972): 12-17.

Daniels, Roy P. and Kiernan, Irene R. "Faculty Counseling at F.I.T." *Junior College Journal* 36 (1965): 32-35.

DeLisle, Frances H. *A Study of Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Office of Institutional Research, May 1965.

Dilley, Josiah S. "Student-Faculty Non-Communication." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 8 (September 1967): 282-285.

Donk, Leonard J. and Oetting, Eugene R. "Change in College Student Attitude Toward Sources of Assistance for Problems." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 8 (September 1967): 315-317.

———. "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 9 (November 1968): 400-403.

Doyle, Kenneth O., Jr. "Faculty Evaluation: Some Considerations and a Model." In *The Proceedings of the First Invitational Conference on Faculty Effectiveness as Evaluated by Students,* edited by Alan L. Sockloff. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1973.

Ducat, Diane and Lieberman, Richard K. "Articulating a Freshman Orientation Program with a Social Science Course." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 57 (September 1978): 61-62.

Duncan, James O. "Analysis of the Faculty Advising System at Oregon State University." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 34 (1973): 1073A-1074A.

Dyste, Ron. "The Los Angeles City College Mobile Advisement Center: A Study of Its Operation," 1970. ED 046 369. MF-$0.98; PC-$5.96.

Evans, N. Dean and Neagley, Ross L. *Planning and Developing Innovative Community Colleges.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Fahsbender, Kenneth E. "A Selective System of Faculty Advising as a Means of Implementing Community College Counseling." Doctoral dissertation, 1969. ED 034 534. MF-$0.98; PC-$9.27.

Feldman, Kenneth A. and Newcomb, Theodore M. *The Impact of College on Students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Fisher, Joseph A. "Yesterday's Student-Tomorrow's Challenge." Champaign, Ill.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Reading Association, 1977. ED 149 305. MF-$0.98; PC-$4.46.

Fogarty, Nancy. "The Freshman Seminar Program at Creighton University." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document,* edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

Francis, John B. "How Do We Get There From Here? Program Design for Faculty Development." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (November/December): 719-732.

Fuhrmann, Barbara S. and Jacobs, Ronne T. "Toward Maximizing Learning Through Attention to Student Learning Styles." Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1976. Mimeographed.

Gamson, Zelda F. "Performance and Personalism in Student-Faculty Relations." *Sociology of Educaton* 40 (1967): 279-301.

Garfield, Learita and McHugh, Elizabeth A. "Learning Counseling: A Higher Education Student Support Service." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (July/August 1978): 382-392.

Gelso, Charles J. and Sims, David M. "Faculty Advising: The Problem of Assigning Students on the Basis of Intended Major." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 9 (September 1968): 334-336.

——— and Thompson, Bert. "Effects of Emergency Academic Counseling." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 11 (July 1970): 276-278.

Gelwick, Beverly P. "Training Faculty To Do Career Advising." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 53 (November 1974): 214-217.

Gibson, Gordon. "A Meta-Presentation of a Theoretical and Research Base for Academic Advisement." San Diego: Paper presented at the national convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1973. ED 085 621. $0.98; PC-$2.96.

Glennen, Robert E. "Faculty Counseling: An Important and Effective Aspect of Student Development." Toronto: Paper presented at the Canadian Guidance and Counseling Assocation, 1971. ED 057 368. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

———. "Intrusive College Counseling." *The School Counselor* 24 (September 1976): 48-50.

Goodrich, Andrew L. "A Retention/Intervention Model for Impacting on Minority Student Attrition at Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." College Park: University of Maryland, 1976. Mimeographed.

Goodson, William D. "Which Do College Students Choose First—Their Major or Their Occupation?" *The Vocational Guidance Quarterly* 27 (December 1978): 150-155.

Grites, Thomas J. "Student Development Through Academic Advising: A 4 x 4 Model." *NASPA Journal* 14 (Winter 1977): 33-37.

———. "Training the Academic Advisor." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document*, edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

———. "Between High School Counselor and College Advisor—A Void." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, in press.

——— and Teague, Gerald V. "No-Shows in the Enrollment Struggle: A Neglected Market." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 19 (January 1978): 59-64.

Hadley, Everett E. "A Program To Improve Freshman-Sophomore Retention." In *Choice or Chance: Planning for Independent College Marketing and Retention*. St. Paul: Northwest Area Foundation, 1976.

———, ed. *Retain*. Des Moines: Drake University, 1977.

———, ed. *Retain*. Des Moines: Drake University, 1978.

Hale, Lester L. "A Bold New Blueprint for Career Planning and Placement." *Journal of College Placement* 34 (December 1973-January 1974 and Spring 1974): 34-40 and 68-74.

Hallberg, Edmond C. "Realism in Academic Advising." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 6 (December 1964): 114-117.

Hardee, Melvene D. *Faculty Advising in Colleges and Universities*. Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1970. ED 041 326. MF-$0.98; HC-$4.46.

Hart, Derrell; Deutsch, Alleen; and Rogers, Elizabeth. "Residence Hall Based Advising for Freshmen." In *National Conference on Academic Advising: A Publication of Proceedings*, edited by Gina Rayfield, Alton D. Roberts and Toni Trombley. Burlington: University of Vermont, 1977.

Hennessey, Mary D. "Some Theoretical and Practical Considerations for Advising Adult Students." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document (1979 Supplement)*, edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Huddleston, Thomas, Jr. and Wiebe, Frank A. "Understanding the Nature of the Student Market for a Private University." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 19 (November 1978): 517-523.

Hutchins, David E. and Miller, William B. "Group Interaction as a Vehicle To Facilitate Faculty-Student Advisement." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 20 (May 1979): 253-257.

Ivey, Allen E. "The Academic Performance of Students Counseled at a University Counseling Service." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 9 (1962): 347-352.

Jones, Robert L., Jr. "A Suggested Training Program for Academic Advisors." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 4 (March 1963): 186-187.

Juola, Arvo E.; Winburne, John W.; and Whitmore, Ann. "Computer-Assisted Academic Advising." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 47 (October 1968): 146-150.

Katz, Joseph, ed. *Services for Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Kaufmann, Paul J. and Netusil, Anton J. "Selected Communication Variables and Their Effect Upon Advisee Satisfaction with Advisor-Advisee Conferences." Washington: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1975. ED 106 701. MF-$0.98; PC-$3.32.

King, Margaret C. "Utilizing Part-Time Paraprofessionals as Academic Advisors: A Model." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document (1979 Supplement)*, edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Koile, Earl A. "A Measure of Interest for Selecting Faculty Counselors." *Educational and Psychological Measurements* 15 (1955): 47-57.

Koloc, Fred; Burns, Linda; and Luedde, David. "Academic Advising in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pittsburgh: A Descriptive Report." Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1978. Mimeographed.

Kopplin, David A. and Rice, Louis C. "Consulting with Faculty: Necessary and Possible." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 53 (January 1975): 367-372.

Kramer, Howard C. "Faculty Advising: A Part of Faculty Development." In *Exchange*. Manhattan, Kan.: Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development, December 1978.

——— and Gardner, Robert E. *Advising by Faculty*. Washington: National Education Association, 1977.

———. "Managing Faculty Advising." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document*, edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

Krumboltz, Helen B. and Shapiro, Johanna. "Counseling Women in Behavioral Self-Direction." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 57 (April 1979): 415-418.

Lacher, Miriam R. B. "On Advising Undergraduate Women: A Psychologist's Advice to Academic Advisors." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 19 (November 1978): 488-493.

Leister, Douglas V. and MacLachlan, Douglas L. "Assessing the Community College Transfer Market: A Metamarketing Application." *Journal of Higher Education* 47 (November/December 1976): 661-680.

Lewis, Walden S., Jr. "Self-Advisement Techniques Used in Conjunction with Group and Individual Academic Advisement." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 32 (1972): 4956A-4957A.

Mahoney, John; Borgard, John H.; and Hornbuckle, Phyllis A. "The Relationship of Faculty Experience and Advisee Load to Perceptions of Academic Advising." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 19 (January 1978): 28-32.

Marienau, Catherine. "Educational Program Planning for Adult Students." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document (1979) Sup-*

plement, edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Marks, Edmond; Ashby, Jefferson D.; and Noll, Gary A. "Recommended Curricular Change and Persistence in College." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 44 (May 1966): 974-977.

Mash, Donald J. "Academic Advising: Too Often Taken for Granted." *The College Board Review* no. 107 (Spring 1978): 32-36.

———. "The Management of Academic Advising." In *Management for Student Affairs*, edited by Dana D. Burnett. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, forthcoming.

McCusker, Ann M. and Osterlund, Blair L. "Community College Advising Model." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 57 (February 1979): 319-320.

Meyer, Peter. *Awarding College Credit for Non-College Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Miller, Richard I. *Evaluating Faculty Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Miller, Theodore K. and Prince, Judith S. *The Future of Student Affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Moller, Nancy. "The Menacing Myth of Masculine Mathematics." *Practical Applications of Research* 1 (March 1979): 3-4. (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa.)

Montes, Delia and Ortega, Ludy. "Retention of the Non-Traditional Student Through Peer Modeling." Chicago: Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1976. ED 130 214. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Morstain, Barry R. "An Analysis of Students' Satisfaction with Their Academic Program." *Journal of Higher Education* 48 (January/February 1977): 1-16.

——— and Gaff, Jerry G. "Student Views of Teaching Improvements." *Educational Record* 58 (Summer 1977): 299-308.

Murry, John P. "The Comparative Effectiveness of Student-to-Student and Faculty Advising Programs." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13 (November 1972): 562-566.

Myers, Rosemary; Mauch, Jack; Hill, Linda; and Williams, Mary E. "Retention Advising Program (RAP): A Model for Involving Liberal Arts Faculty as Advisors for Drop-Out Prone Students." Pocatello, Idaho: Idaho State University, 1979. Mimeographed.

Newburg, Charlene. *Creating Change for College Women: The Catalyst Model Staff Training Program*. New York: Catalyst, 1978.

New Jersey Department of Higher Education. "Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment Projections 1977-1994." Trenton: New Jersey Department of Higher Education, 1979. Mimeographed.

Newman, Mary A. "The Student and the College Community: A Study of Attrition and Persistence in a Highly Selective Liberal Arts College," 1965. ED 003 068. MF-$0.98; PC-$10.77.

Nieves, Luis. *Coping on Campus: The Problems of Minority College Students.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Noel, Lee. "College Student Retention: A Campus-Wide Responsibility." *Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors* 21 (July 1976): 33-36.

O'Banion, Terry. "An Academic Advising Model." *Junior College Journal* 42 (1972): 62-69.

O'Neil, James M.; Johnson, Diana D.; Barke, Kathryn H.; Myers, Randy. "Identifying Faculty Resources and Women Role Models To Facilitate Consultation and Delivery of Career Development Services on the Campus." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 20 (May 1979): 277-278.

Palladino, Joseph J. and Tryon, Georgiana S. "Have the Problems of Entering Freshmen Changed?" *Journal of College Student Personnel* 19 (July 1978): 313-316.

Parker, Delores A. "A Case for Peer Counseling," 1976. ED 125 705. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Pervin, Lawrence A. and Rubin, Donald B. "Student Dissatisfaction with College and the College Dropout: A Transactional Approach." *Journal of Social Psychology* 72 (1967): 285-295.

Peterson, Steve and Lambert, Leo. "Incorporating Academic Advising with Residence Hall Living." In *National Conference on Academic Advising: A Publication of Proceedings,* edited by Gina Rayfield, Alton D. Roberts and Toni Trombley. Burlington: University of Vermont, 1977.

Pino, Joseph A. "The Organization, Structure, Functions, and Student Perceptions of Effectiveness of Undergraduate Academic Advisement Centers." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 35 (1975): 4205A-4206A.

Polson, Cheryl J. and Jurich, Anthony P. "The Departmental Academic Advising Center: An Alternative to Faculty Advising." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 20 (May 1979): 249-253.

Pommrehn, D. Jack. "Computer Assisted Degree Progress Reporting." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1978. Mimeographed.

Recer, James D. "Analysis of Alternative Academic Advisement Systems in University College at the University of Oklahoma." *Dissertation Abstracts* 29 (1969): 2495A.

Robertson, James H. "Academic Advising in Colleges and Universities: Its Present State and Present Problems." *North Central Association Quarterly* 32 (1958): 228-239.

Robinson, Lora H. "Renovating the Freshman Year." *Research Currents*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, December 1972. ED 068 075. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Sacks, Susan R. and Eisenstein, Hester. "Feminism and Psychological Autonomy: A Study in Decision Making." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 57 (April 1979): 419-423.

Sawhill, John C. "Lifelong Learning: Scandal of the Next Decade?" *Change* 10 (December 1978/January 1979): 7.

Scher, Murray. "A Small College Deals with Student Retention." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 20 (March 1979): 176.

Schlossberg, Nancy K. "Five Propositions About Adult Development." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 19 (September 1978): 418-423.

Sedlacek, William E. and Brooks, Glenwood C., Jr. *Racism in American Education: A Model for Change*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1976.

Seldin, Peter. "New Emphases in the Evaluation of Professors." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56 (March 1975): 496-497.

Shelton, Joe B. "A Comparison of Faculty Academic Advising and Academic Advising by Professional Counselors: Final Report." Shawnee Mission, Kan.; Johnson County Community College, 1972. ED 065 088. MF-$0.98; PC-$7.77.

Shulman, Carol H. "Recent Trends in Student Retention." AAHE/ERIC Higher Education. *Research Currents*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, May 1976. ED 127 841. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Siewert, Judith A. "The Academic Counseling Center: A Centralized Advising and Counseling Concept." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 16 (March 1975): 163-164.

Smith, Joyce. "What Could the Advisor Have Said Besides 'What Are You Taking Next Term?' " Los Angeles: Paper presented at the annual convention of the American College Personnel Association, 1979. Mimeographed.

Smith, Norman R. "Institutional Environment." Philadelphia: Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on Student Retention, 1978. Mimeographed.

Spencer, Robert W.; Peterson, Erlend D.; Nielsen, R. Bruce; Tanner, Jeffrey M.; and Goodrich, Roger E. "Computer Assisted Advisement at Brigham Young University." Chicago: Paper presented at annual convention of the American College Personnel Association, 1976. Mimeographed.

Starr, Ann M.; Betz, Ellen L.; and Menne, John W. "Differences in College Student Satisfaction: Academic Dropouts, Nonacademic Dropouts, and Nondropouts." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 19 (1972): 318-322.

Stein, Gordon B. and Spille, Henry A. "Academic Advising Reaches Out." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 53 (September 1974): 61-64.

Teague, Gerald V. and Grites, Thomas J. "Faculty Contracts and Academic Advising." *Journal of College Student Personnel,* in press.

Thomas, Francena. "Soul Food." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document,* edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

Thompson, Carmen and Jensen, David. "Community-Based Educational Counseling for Adults (CBECA)," 1977. ED 138 784. MF-$0.98; PC-$2.96.

Titley, Bonnie S. "Academic Advising: Training and/or Educating." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document,* edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

Titterington, Jean A. "Aiding the Student as Comparison Shopper." *New Directions for Experiential Learning* 1 (1978): 73-82.

Towner, Richard J. "Sources of Academic Advice Utilized by Successful Students When Making Important Academic Decisions." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 36 (1975): 2615A-2652A.

Trombley, Toni. "A Self-Study of a Centralized Academic Advising Unit at the University of Vermont." In *Academic Advising: A Resource Document (1979 Supplement),* edited by David S. Crockett. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

Upcraft, M. Lee. "Undergraduate Students as Academic Advisers." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 49 (June 1971): 827-831.

Vitulli, Ramon A. and Singleton, Roger L. "Computer Assisted Advising and Degree Evaluation." *College and University* 47 (1972): 494-502.

Walsh, E. Michael. "Revitalizing Academic Advisement." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 57 (May 1979): 446-449.

Winston, Eric V. A. "Advising Minority Students." *Integrated Education* 14 (1976): 22-23.

Woods, James A. "Evaluating Life Experiences: Current Practices at the Collegiate Level." *Alternative Higher Education* 2 (1977): 105-118.

———. "Costing and Crediting of Life Experiences: Some Research at the Collegiate Level." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (July/August 1978): 358-371.

Yale, Stephen L. "Strategic Retention Planning" and "The Tools of Retention." Philadelphia: Papers presented at the Invitational Conference on Student Retention, 1978. Mimeographed.

Zultowski, Walter H. and Catron, David W. "Students as Curriculum Advisers: Reinterpreted." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 17 (May 1976): 199-204.

Zuspan, G. William. "Support Systems for New Students." Philadelphia: Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on Student Retention, 1978. Mimeographed.